Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ACI-546

A

GRAMMAR

OF

THE IDIOM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

PREPARED AS A SOLID BASIS FOR THE INTERPRETATION
OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

BY

DR. GEORGE BENEDICT WINER.

SEVENTH EDITION, ENLARGED AND IMPROVED.

BY

DR. GOTTLIEB LÜNEMANN,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GOETTINGEN.

REVISED AND AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION.

Andover:
WARREN F. DRAPER.
1892.

PA
813
.W56
1892

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1874, by
WARREN F. DRAPER,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

ANDOVER:
PRINTED BY WARREN F. DRAPER.

PREFACE TO THE SIXTH EDITION.

When this Grammar first made its appearance, in 1822, the object proposed was to oppose the unbridled license with which the diction of the New Testament was then, and had long been, handled in commentaries and exegetical lectures; and to apply, as far as practicable, the results of an enlightened philology, as deduced and taught by Hermann and his school, to the study of the language of the New Testament. It was high time that some voice should be raised against the inveterate empiricism of expositors, and that some effort should be made to emancipate the writers of the N. T. from the bondage of a perverted philology, which styled itself sacred and yet showed not the least respect towards the sacred authors and their well-considered phraseology.

The fundamental error — the πρῶτον ψεῦδος — of the Biblical philology and exegesis to which we refer, consisted ultimately in this, that neither the Hebrew nor the language of the N. T. was regarded as a living idiom (Herm. Eurip. Med. p. 401.), designed to be used by men as the medium of intercourse. Had scholars deliberately inquired, whether those departures from the current laws of speech which were assumed to exist in the Bible in such prodigious multitudes, were compatible with the essential principles of a language intended for the ordinary purposes of life, they would not so arbitrarily have held every kind of anomaly to be permissible; and would not have delighted to attribute to the Apostles in almost every verse an enallage or a substitution of the wrong construction for the right.

The older commentaries belonging to the period of the Reformation are comparatively free from such perversions; but when

we read certain commentaries of the 18th and 19th centuries still current, we are constrained to conclude that the main characteristic of the language of the N. T. is a total want of precision and regularity. For these interpreters are continually showing how here a wrong tense is used, there a wrong case, here a comparative for a positive, there ὁ for τις, *but* instead of *for*, *consequently* for *because*, *on the other side* for *on this side* (*what* for *so* Isa. viii. 20). Such exegetical learning makes a reader quite impatient with the sacred writers for their ignorance of the ordinary principles of language. He cannot comprehend how such men in oral discourse, where this lawlessness of speech must certainly have been still more conspicuous, could have made themselves understood even, much less how they could have won over to Christianity a great number of persons of education.

But this system of explaining every difficulty by a *pro* or an *idem quod* had a serious as well as a ludicrous aspect. For does not Scripture become, as an eminent linguist long ago intimated, like a waxen nose, which every one can twist as he pleases, in proportion to his ignorance of the learned tongues? Would it have been impossible, or even difficult, for such a man as Storr, for example, had the task been assigned him, to have found in the words of the Apostles any favorite notion whatever? And does such a view of N. T. diction accord with the dignity of sacred writers?[1] Every one who now-a-days should insist on using in the ordinary intercourse of life such perversions of language as the following: *I shall come to thee to-day* for *I came to thee to-day; no prophet ever came out of Galilee* for *no prophet will ever come out of Galilee* (Jno. vii. 52); *I call you no longer servants* for *I did not call you mere servants* (Jno. xv. 15); *for Jesus himself testified, that a prophet has no honor in his own country* for *although Jesus himself testified*, etc. (Jno. iv. 44); *I saw the forest that was magnificently covered with foliage* for *a forest that was*, etc. (Jno. v. 1[2]); *send me the book, and I will read it*, for *thou wilt*

[1] *Herm.* ad Viger. p. 786: Diligenter caveant tirones, ne putent, viros spiritu sancto afflatos sprevisse sermonem mortalium, sed meminerint potius, illam interpretandi rationem, qua nonnulli theologorum utuntur, *nihil esse nisi blasphemiam.*

[2] To what extent expositors of the old school were devoid of all sense of expression may be seen (instar omnium) in *Kühnöl's* reasoning, Mt. p. 120 sq.

send me the book, etc.; *to whom it was revealed that* for *to whom was was revealed, yet so that*, etc. (1 Pet. i. 12[1]); *Christ is dead wherefore risen again* for *but risen again; he is not more learned* for *he is not learned; he rejoiced that he should see*, etc., *and he saw and rejoiced*, for *he would have rejoiced if he had seen*, etc., *he rejoiced even at what he already saw* (Jno. viii. 56); *he began to wash* for *he washed* (Jno. xiii. 56), and the like, — would be regarded as having lost his reason. Were all the instances of a *quid pro quo* which many expositors during the decennaries just past have put into the mouth of the Apostles to be collected, the list could not fail to be astounding.

When, at the commencement of my career as a university tutor, I undertook to combat this absurd system of interpretation, I was aware that there were scholars far more competent for the task than myself; and, in fact, what I accomplished in the earlier editions of this book was but imperfect. My attempt, however, was cordially encouraged by distinguished men, and in particular by Vater and D. Schulz. Others pointed out, sometimes indeed in a spirit of bitterness, the imperfections of the work; and to these unsparing critics I have been greatly indebted, not only in this publication, but in all my exegetical labors. By discussions annexed to the second edition (1828) the grammatical contents of the work were enlarged, and the third edition came out greatly improved, both in copiousness and accuracy, by a more extensive study of the writings of the Greek prose authors and of the Hellenistic Jews. From that time forward I have labored incessantly to improve the work; and I have been animated by the aid which philological and exegetical publications suited to my purpose have furnished me in rich abundance. At the same time, the intelligent investigation of the N. T. diction has been daily gaining ground; and the use of the Grammar by commentators has been growing more and more evident. The work began to attract the attention of professed philologists even. At the same time I have always been far from thinking the correct grammatical elucidation of the N. T. to be its only proper exposition; and I have, in silence, allowed some to regard me even as an opponent of what is now called the theological interpretation.

[1] On this passage see my Erlanger Pfingstprogr. 1830. 4to.

The present edition — the sixth — will show again on every page, that I have spared no effort to arrive at truth. Deeply, however, do I regret, that in the midst of my labors I was overtaken by a nervous affection of the eyes, which has brought me to the verge of total blindness. This calamity has compelled me to employ the eyes and hands of others to complete this edition. I cannot omit this opportunity of expressing publicly my sincere thanks to all the young friends whose indefatigable assistance only has enabled me, in spite of my frequent forebodings, to accomplish my task.

The change in the arrangement of the matter in Part III. will, I trust, be approved. In other respects, it has been my especial aim to treat every point with greater completeness, and in smaller space, than in previous editions; (the text of the Grammar now occupies *eight sheets* fewer than before). With this view I adopted all possible abbreviations in the Biblical and Greek citations.[1] It is hoped, however, that these, as well as those for the names of more recent authors,[2] will everywhere be intelligible. The citations have been verified anew throughout; and, so far as I know, not a single work that has appeared since 1844 has been left unused, or at least unnoticed.

The text of the N. T. I have uniformly, that is except when there was a question of various readings, quoted in accordance with the second Leipsic edition of Dr. Tischendorf, which at present has probably the most extensive circulation.

May this new revision — the last the work will ever receive from me — contribute to the diffusion of Biblical truth, so far as any such work can.

[1] The Greek writers are only quoted by the page when the division by chapters has not obtained currency: Plato, according to the edition by *Stephan.*; Strabo and Athenaeus, by *Casaubon*; Demosthen. and Isocrat., by *H. Wolf*; Dionys. Hal., by *Reiske*; Dio Cass., by *Reimar.*; Dio Chrysost., by *Morell.*

[2] It may be remarked here, that instead of *Kuinoel* (the Latinized form of the name), *Kühnöl*, as the family wrote their name in German, is used everywhere, except in Latin citations.

Leipsic, October, 1855.

PREFACE TO THE SEVENTH EDITION.

WINER'S foreboding that the sixth edition would be the last revision from his hand has unfortunately been realized. But even while sensible of his approaching death, the indefatigable man took incessant interest in his Grammar, and labored to the very end of his life to perfect it. Without altering the general distribution of matter as it appeared in the sixth edition, he constantly improved the book in details, — by additions of greater or less extent in more than three hundred and forty places, by erasures and reconstructions, by the multiplication of parallel passages from biblical and from profane literature, by a more precise definition of thoughts and expressions, by the correction of trivial oversights and mistakes, etc. etc. Thus he has not left us without bequeathing to us in this book a legacy richer than ever.

When the publisher confided to me the preparation of the new edition which had become necessary, I could not hesitate a moment what course to adopt. It was clear to me, in the first place, that the book must retain absolutely and throughout the character of a work by Winer. This was demanded, on the one hand, by reverence towards the departed author; whom no one has hitherto surpassed — whom hardly any one among those now living will surpass — in a department which he cultivated with especial fondness for more than a generation. It appeared also, on the other hand, to be a sacred duty towards the theological public, to whom Winer's work, on account of its scholarly exactness and copious erudition, justly became long ago a precious possession and a universally acknowledged authority. I considered myself, therefore, as bound to abstain from every radical

alteration of the text, either as respects the general arrangement or as respects the development of details. My task, rather, I perceived to be merely this: while preserving in its integrity the character of Winer's book, to increase as far as possible, in the spirit and intent of Winer, its usefulness for students of the present day. I have taken especial pains to work into the text the numerous manuscript notes from Winer's hand. In doing this, Winer's own words have been retained as far as it was any way feasible; and changes, when necessary, have always been restricted so closely, that they affect merely what is unessential, never the matter itself. Further, I have made it a point, not merely to correct silently the obvious oversights and mistakes I met with — and they proved to be more numerous than I expected — and to give to the cross-references a definiteness in which they were often deficient, but also to consult, as far as pertinent, the theological and philological works which have appeared since Winer's death, and to use in this new edition what they contained worthy of attention. Whenever, too, a question of textual criticism is involved, regard has been paid to the readings of the Codex Sinaiticus. Yet great self-restraint has been imposed throughout, in order not to augment excessively a work already of considerable bulk.

Winer's additions and alterations have been directly incorporated with the text without being indicated by a particular sign. They will be plain to every one who will take the pains to compare the seventh edition with the sixth. On the other hand, the additions which I have made have been in all cases marked by square brackets. The square brackets already used by Winer here and there, have consequently been made to give place to other signs; such as round brackets, dashes, etc. In conclusion it may be remarked that very great care has been taken to secure typographical accuracy.

And now may the book, in this its seventh edition, subserve its purpose to afford the interpretation of the New Testament a stable foundation.

DR. LÜNEMANN.

Göttingen, August 19, 1866.

AMERICAN EDITOR'S PREFACE.

WINER'S Grammar is now for the fourth time rendered accessible to English readers. A translation of the first edition was made by the late Professors Stuart and Robinson, and published at Andover in 1825. The fourth edition of the original, rendered into English by Professors Agnew and Ebbeke, appeared in 1839. Twenty years later Professor Masson's translation of the sixth German edition was published at Edinburgh (and Philadelphia). The present work was originally announced (in April 1866) as a revision of Professor Masson's. The labor of revision was drawing towards completion, and nearly three hundred pages of the book had been stereotyped, when appeared the seventh German edition, under the supervision of Dr. Lünemann. Some unavoidable delay ensued before the revision and the printing were begun anew in conformity with this new edition. These facts explain why the publication of the present volume follows the original announcement so tardily.

The book still remains, substantially, a revision of Professor Masson's translation. The changes introduced have been such as could be made upon the printed sheets of that work. This circumstance has frequently affected their form and sometimes their number. But although Professor Masson's version has been retained as the basis of this, it is believed that hardly a paragraph of his work remains altogether unaltered; and sometimes the alterations amount in effect to a new translation, — a translation which for entire pages has but a few phrases in common with its predecessor.

In making the changes described it has been the editor's aim to render the version a faithful reproduction of the original. A faithful translation, he believes, should not only be free from

intentional addition,[1] omission, or alteration, but in a work of this kind should adhere as closely to the author's expression as English idiom will permit. Accordingly, should the renderings seem, here and there, to have lost a little in ease, a compensation will be found, it is hoped, in their increased accuracy.

It has not been judged necessary to annotate any interpretation having a doctrinal bearing, even though such interpretation be debatable on grammatical grounds, or to qualify an expression or two respecting the sacred writers which may strike many English readers as unwarrantably free; for the book is likely to be used either by students with mature understandings in exercise, or by pupils under the guidance of competent teachers. The reasons which have led the editor to disregard the request that he would abridge and otherwise alter the original work will be suggested by Professor Lünemann's remarks upon this point.

The notation of the sections, etc., has been carefully retained throughout. When it could be done conveniently, the cross-references have been rendered more definite by subjoining the number of the page. To aid those who may use this book in connection with Commentaries which refer to the Grammar by pages, the paging of the sixth and seventh German editions, as well as of Professor Masson's translation, has been noted on the outer margin of the leaves. The indexes have been revised, and that of Greek words has been considerably enlarged. Further, the Index of Passages in the New Testament has been made complete, and the references themselves have been carefully verified; this laborious work has been performed by Mr. G. W. Warren, formerly a student in this Seminary, at present Professor of Biblical Interpretation in the Baptist Theological Seminary at Chicago, Illinois. This Index, it is believed, will be highly valued by students. A glance at it will show with how little exaggeration the book may be called a grammatical commentary on the more difficult texts of the New Testament. Other references the editor has been content simply to transfer to the pages of the translation. This will account for their frequent want of uniformity.

Pains have been taken to give the work that typographical

[1] In a single passage it seemed necessary to append a note; see page 598.

accuracy which is a leading requisite in a satisfactory manual. On this point, however, the editor would not speak too confidently; for even in the seventh German edition, which is as superior to the sixth in accuracy of typography as it is in elegance, errata have been discovered by the score. It is hoped that the mistakes which have slipped in, will not exceed in number those detected, and silently rectified, in the German original.

In conclusion, the editor would express the desire that the book in its present form may both facilitate and increase that patient, reverent study of the letter of the Inspired Word, which is indispensable to the fullest reception of it as spirit and life.

J. HENRY THAYER.

Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.
October, 1868.

NOTE.

In this new impression the Biblical references, both in the body of the work and as collected in the N. T. Index, have been verified again. A few of the former, which appear to be wrong as they stand but which the editor had not the means of correcting, have been marked with [?]. The alterations in the N. T. Index are so numerous, that it has been found convenient occasionally to sink an added reference into a foot-note; and, in inserting other references to the pages, to disregard sometimes the strict numerical order. In some instances, also, the gap left by the removal of erroneous references has not been closed up. The re-examination of this index proves it to be not quite "complete"; but there are no omissions, it is believed, which a student will regret.

J. H. T.

Andover, September, 1873.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

On the Scope, Treatment, and History of N. T. Grammar, §§ 1-4, 1

PART FIRST.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION ESPECIALLY IN ITS GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS.

§ 1. Various Opinions concerning the Character of the N. T. Diction, . 12

§ 2. Basis of the N. T. Diction, ... 20

§ 3. Hebrew-Aramaic Tinge of the N. T. Diction, ... 27

§ 4. Grammatical Character of the N. T. Diction, ... 35

PART SECOND.

THE GRAMMATICAL FORMS AS RESPECTS THEIR FORMATION (INFLECTION).

§ 5. Orthography and Orthographic Principles, ... 40

§ 6. Accentuation, ... 49

§ 7. Punctuation, ... 55

§ 8. Rare Forms of the First and Second Declensions, . . . 60

§ 9. Rare Forms of the Third Declension, ... 64

§ 10. Foreign Words and Words which are Indeclinable, . . . 66

§ 11. Inflection and Comparison of Adjectives, ... 68

§ 12. Augment and Reduplication of Regular Verbs, ... 70

§ 13. Rare Forms in the Tenses and Persons of Regular Verbs, . . 73

§ 14. Rare Inflections of Verbs in MI and of Irregular Verbs, . . . 78

§ 15. Defective Verbs, ... 81

§ 16. Formation of Words, ... 91

PART THIRD.

SYNTAX.

A. IMPORT AND USE OF THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I. THE ARTICLE.

PAGE

§ 17. The Article as a Pronoun, ... 104

§ 18. Articulus Praepositivus, **a.** before Nouns, ... 105

§ 19. Omission of the Article before Nouns, ... 119

§ 20. Articulus Praepositivus, **b.** with Attributives, ... 131

CHAPTER II. PRONOUNS.

§ 21. The Pronouns in general, ... 140

§ 22. Personal and Possessive Pronouns, ... 143

§ 23. The Demonstrative Pronoun, ... 157

§ 24. The Relative Pronoun, ... 163

§ 25. The Interrogative Pronoun and the Indefinite Pronoun ΤΙΣ, . . 168

§ 26. Hebraisms in connection with certain Pronouns, ... 171

CHAPTER III. THE NOUN.

§ 27. Number and Gender of Nouns, ... 174

§ 28. The Cases in general, ... 179

§ 29. Nominative and Vocative, ... 181

§ 30. Genitive, ... 184

§ 31. Dative, ... 208

§ 32. Accusative, ... 221

§ 33. Connection of a Verb (neuter) with its dependent Noun by means of Prepositions, ... 232

§ 34. Adjectives, ... 234

§ 35. Comparative, ... 239

§ 36. Superlative, ... 246

§ 37. Numerals, ... 248

CHAPTER IV. THE VERB.

§ 38. Active and Middle Voices, ... 251

§ 39. The Passive, ... 260

§ 40. The Tenses, ... 264

PAGE

§ 41. The Indicative, Subjunctive, and Optative Moods, ... 281

§ 42. The Conjunction ᾽AN with the three Moods, ... 302

§ 43. The Imperative, ... 310

§ 44. The Infinitive, ... 317

§ 45. The Participle, ... 340

CHAPTER V. THE PARTICLES.

§ 46. The Particles in general, ... 356

§ 47. The Prepositions in general, and such as govern the Genitive in particular, ... 358

§ 48. Prepositions with the Dative, ... 384

§ 49. Prepositions with the Accusative, ... 396

§ 50. Interchange, Accumulation, and Repetition of Prepositions, . . 409

§ 51. Use of Prepositions in Circumlocutions, ... 423

§ 52. Construction of Verbs compounded with Prepositions, . . . 425

§ 53. Conjunctions, ... 433

§ 54. Adverbs, ... 462

§ 55. Negative Particles, ... 473

§ 56. Construction of Negative Particles, ... 500

§ 57. Interrogative Particles, ... 508

B. STRUCTURE OF PROPOSITIONS, AND THEIR COMBINATION INTO PERIODS.

§ 58. The Proposition and its Component Parts in general, . . 512

§ 59. Extension of a Simple Sentence in its Subject and Predicate: Attributives, Apposition, ... 523

§ 60. Connection of Sentences: Periods, ... 537

§ 61. Position of Words and Clauses, especially when Irregular (Hyperbaton), ... 546

§ 62. Interrupted Structure of Sentences; Parentheses, ... 561

§ 63. Broken and Heterogeneous Structure of Sentences; Anacoluthon, Oratio variata, ... 566

§ 64. Defective Structure of Sentences; Ellipsis, Aposiopesis, . . . 580

§ 65. Redundant Structure of Sentences; Pleonasm (Superfluity), Diffuseness, ... 601

PAGE

§ 66. Condensed and Expanded Structure of Sentences (Breviloquence, Constructio Praegnans, Attraction, etc.), ... 619

§ 67. Abnormal Relation of Individual Words in a Sentence (Hypallage), . 631

§ 68. Regard to Sound in the Structure of Sentences; Paronomasia and Play upon Words (Annominatio), Parallelism, Verse, . . . 636

INDEX.

I. Index of Principal Subjects, ... 643

II. Index of Greek Words and Forms, ... 652

III. Index of Passages in the N. T. explained or cited, ... 668

INTRODUCTION.

ON THE SCOPE, TREATMENT, AND HISTORY OF N. T. GRAMMAR.

§ 1. The language of the N. T., like every other, presents two aspects for scientific consideration, inasmuch as the words which we find in the N. T. following one another in connected discourse may be considered either by themselves, in reference to their origin and their meaning (the *material* element); or as respects their legitimate employment in the structure of clauses and periods (the *formal* element). The former is the business of Lexicography; the latter belongs to Grammar, which must be carefully distinguished from N. T. *Stylistics* (Rhetoric).

On distinguishing Lexicography from Grammar, see Pott in the Kieler Allgem. Monatsschr. 1851. Juli. The Lexicography of the N. T., of which Synonymy forms a very important part, though its importance was not duly recognized till of late, has always been cultivated in a merely practical manner. A *theory* of it, however, may be laid down; which might be styled *Lexicology*, — a term that has recently come into use. That this theory has not as yet been fully developed and perfected is the less surprising, since even the classic tongues remain destitute of a Lexicology; and in the department of Exegetical Theology a theory of Biblical Criticism (higher and lower) is still a desideratum. This deficiency, however, has had a decidedly unfavorable effect on practical lexicography, as might be easily shown by a close examination of the lexicographical works on the N. T. which have hitherto appeared, even the most recent not excepted.[1]

N. T. *Stylistics* or Rhetoric (the latter appellation has already been employed by Glassius and by Bauer, author of Rhetorica Paulina), should exhibit the characteristics of N. T. style in its freedom and individuality,

[1] For some remarks on the theory of lexicography, see *Schleiermacher*, Hermeneutik, S. 49. 84. A commencement towards a comparative lexicography has been made by *Zeller*, in his theolog. Jahrb. II. 443 ff.

14 restricted only by the character and aim of the composition; and this it should do both generally, and in reference to the peculiarities of the *genera dicendi* and of the respective writers (cf. Hand, Lehrb. d. lat. Styls. p. 25 sq.). In this department much remains to be done, (particularly as respects the theory of rhetorical figures, erroneous views respecting which have at all times caused much mischief in the interpretation of the N. T.).

2 The preparatory labors of Bauer and Dan. Schulze,[1] however, are of service;
7th ed. and Wilke has made a compilation (N. T. Rhetorik, Dresd. 1843. 8vo.)
2
6th ed. worthy of attention. Schleiermacher had already given excellent hints in his Hermeneutik. As respects the discourses of Jesus and the apostolic epistles, it would be best to follow the example of the ancient rhetoricians, and treat in Biblical Rhetoric of the style of reasoning. This would prevent the excessive subdivision of N. T. Exegetics, and the separation of kindred subjects, which, when treated in connection, afford mutual light. Cf., besides, Gersdorf, Beiträge zur Sprachcharakterist. d. N. T. 1 Bd. S. 7; Keil, Lehrb. der Hermeneutik, S. 28; C. J. Kellman, Diss. de usu Rhetorices hermeneutico. Gryph. 1766. 4to.

It may be incidentally remarked, that in their exposition of Exegetical Theology our Encyclopaedias still leave much to be desired. And in practice, too, N. T. Hermeneutics is not properly distinguished from N. T. Philology,[2] as we may call that entire department of Exegetical Theology which has just been sketched.

§ 2. A grammatical exposition of the idiom of the N. T., in so far as it is a variety of the Greek language, would strictly considered involve only a systematic comparison of that idiom with the grammatical structure of the later Greek literary language; for with this last the idiom of the N. T. is closely connected, both chronologically and generically. As, however, this later Greek itself has not yet been delineated in its peculiarities as a whole, and as the idiom of the N. T. also exhibits throughout the influence of a *foreign* tongue (the Hebrew-Aramaic) upon the Greek, N. T.
15 Grammar must be so far extended as to comprise a scientific

[1] *K. Lud. Bauer*, Rhetorica Paullina. Halle, 1782. 3 pts. in 2 Vol. 8vo.; also Philologia Thucydideo-Paullina. Halle, 1773. 8vo. (To these may be added: *H. G. Tzschirner*, observationes Pauli Ap. epistolar. scriptoris ingenium concernentes. Viteb. 1800. 3 Partes. 4to.) *J. Dan. Schulze*, der schriftstellerische Werth und Charakter des Johannes. Weissenf. 1803. 8vo.; also, der schriftsteller. Werth und Char. des Petrus, Judas und Jacobus. eb. 1802. 8vo.; also, über den schriftst. Char. und Werth des Evang. Markus, in *Keil* and *Tzschirner's* Analekt. 2 Bds. 2 St. S. 104–151. 3 St. S. 69–132. 3 Bds. 1 St. S. 88–127.

[2] I should prefer this old and intelligible appellation, "Philologia sacra N. T." (cf. *J. Ch. Beck*, conspect. system. philol. sacrae. Bas. 1760. 12 Section. 4to.) to that which *Schleiermacher*, following classic usage, proposes, "Grammar"; see *Lücke*, on his Hermeneutik, S. 10.

exposition of the mode in which the Jewish authors of the N. T. wrote the Greek of their time.

If it were proposed e.g. to write a grammar of the Egyptian or Alexandrian variety of the Greek (as this variety had been moulded there in the mouths of Greek-speaking residents from various parts of the world), it would be enough to collect all its distinctive peculiarities, that is to say, all that make it a separate dialect; not indeed simply stringing them together in a fragmentary way, but arranging them systematically under the several divisions of grammar, and pointing out how and to what extent they respectively modified the general laws of the Greek language (by abandoning niceties, misusing analogies, etc.). The idiom of the N. T., as it is a variety of the later Greek, should it require a grammar of its own, could only be exhibited as a species of a species; and thus a grammar of the N. T. would presuppose a grammar of the later Greek. But N. T. Grammar cannot easily be so restricted even in thought, still less can the idea be carried out to advantage. For, on the one hand, the Grammar of later Greek, especially in its oral popular form, has not yet been scientifically investigated;[1] consequently, the groundwork for N. T. Grammar exists in thought rather than in fact. On the other hand, the idiom of the N. T. displays also the influence of a non-cognate language, the Hebrew-Aramaic, upon the Greek. N. T. Grammar, therefore, must extend its limits in two directions: Presuming the reader to be acquainted with the Grammar of classic Greek, it must point out in the manner already described the peculiarities of the later Greek, as exhibited in the N. T.; and likewise show, in the same scientific way, how and to what extent the Greek was modified by Hebrew-Aramaic influence. It would be wrong, however, to attempt to keep the two quite separate,[2] for the mingling of the (later) Greek with the national (or Jewish) element in the mind of the writers of the N. T., produced a single composite syntax, which must be recognized and exhibited in its essential unity.

3 7th ed.

3 6th ed.

[1] Valuable information, though rather lexical than grammatical, will be found in *Lobeck's* notes on Phrynichi Eclog. Lips. 1820. 8vo. Previously *Irmisch* (on Herodian) and *Fischer* (de vitiis Lexicor. N. T.) had collected much useful matter. Copious hints relative to the graecitas fatiscens have been more recently presented in the improved texts of the Byzantine writers, and the indices (of very unequal merit) appended to most of them in the Bonn edition; as well as in *Boissonade's* notes in the anecdot. graec. (Paris, 1829 ff. V. 8.), and in his editions of Marinus, Philostratus, Nicetas Eugen., Babrius, etc.; and, lastly, in *Mullach's* ed. of Hierocles (Berl. 1853. 8vo.), [cf. also his Grammatik der griech. Vulgarsprache in histor. Entwickelung. Berl. 1856. 8vo.]. To the later Greek element appropriate reference is made likewise in *Lobeck's* Paralipomena grammaticae Gr. Lips. 1837. 2 pts. 8vo., in his Pathologiae sermonis Gr. proleg. Lips. 1843. 8vo., and pathol. Graeci serm. elementa, Königsb. 1853. I. 8vo., and also in *ῥηματικόν* s. verbor. Gr. et nominum verball. technologia, ib. 1846. 8vo.

[2] For judicious remarks on the lexical treatment of Hebraisms, see *Schleiermacher's* Hermeneutik, S. 65.

This mode of treating N. T. Grammar will undergo a *partial* change
16 whenever the grammar of the later Greek language shall have received an independent exposition; for then it will not be necessary to *prove* the peculiarities of this later language by examples, — a task from which the N. T. grammarian cannot for the time be released. But *one* portion of the present contents of a grammar will gradually disappear, viz. the
4 *polemic*, which opposes inveterate and deeply rooted prejudices, or errors
7th ed. which have again made their appearance. As yet, however, this negative vindication of the true character of the diction of the N. T. still continues indispensable; for, well-known expositors even of very recent date (Kühnöl, Flatt, Klausen in his Evangeliencomm.) have shown us again how deeply rooted is that old grammatical empiricism which deems it an abomination ultra Fischerum (or even Storrium) sapere.

Special grammars of separate portions of the N. T., as of the writings of John, of Paul, are clearly out of the question. The distinctive qualities
4 that mark the diction of these writers in particular, consist almost entirely
6th ed. in the use of certain favorite expressions, or relate to the department of Rhetoric, as may be seen from the observations of Blackwall in his Crit. Sacr. N. T. II. 2. 8. p. 322 sqq. ed. Lips. To this also peculiarities in the collocation of words are mostly to be assigned. Grammar is but seldom affected by these peculiarities of individuals. Accordingly Schulze and Schulz[1] have, on the whole, formed a more correct estimate of such peculiarities of diction than Gersdorf, whose well-known work — no great contribution of *sure* results even to verbal criticism — must have almost proved its own refutation, if it had had to be continued on the principles hitherto laid down.

§ 3. Although investigation into the language of the N. T. is the basis of all sound interpretation, yet N. T. Grammar has been till a recent period almost entirely excluded by Biblical philologists from the range of their inquiries. While the lexical element of the N. T. language has been the subject of repeated investigation, the grammatical has been treated at the most only so far as it stood connected with the discussion of the Hebraisms of the N.T.[2]

[1] His remarks on the character of the N. T. diction are contained in his dissertation on the Parable of the Steward (Bresl. 1821. 8vo.) and that on the Lord's Supper (Leipzig, 1824; 2d improved edit. 1831. 8vo.), and also in several articles in the Wachlersch. theol. Annalen. In both dissertations, which are of an exegetical character, his observations, mostly acute, seem out of place, as they throw very little light on exegesis. Textual criticism, however, might have turned his views to good account, if the distinguished writer had only been pleased to give them to us in full. Cf. also *Schleiermacher*, Hermeneutik, S. 129.

[2] An honorable exception among earlier expositors is the nearly forgotton *G. F. Heupel*, who in his copious and almost purely philological Commentary on the Gospel of Mark (Strassburg, 1716. 8vo.) makes many excellent grammatical observations.

Only Casp. Wyss (1650) and G. Pasor (1655) conceived more 17
completely the idea of a N. T. grammar; but their efforts were
unavailing to accomplish its recognition as a special department
of exegetical discipline. During a period of one hundred and
sixty years after them, Haab was the first to publish a special 5
treatise on the Grammar of the N. T.; but his rather uncritical 7th ed.
work, besides being restricted to the Hebraisms, was adapted to
retard the science, rather than to promote it.

The first author who in some degree collected and explained the peculiarities of the N. T. diction, was the celebrated Sal. Glass (†1656) in his Philologia Sacra, the third book of which is entitled Grammatica Sacra, and the fourth Grammaticae Sacrae Appendix.[1] But as he everywhere makes the Hebrew his point of departure, and touches upon the language 5
of the N. T. only so far as it coincides with that, his treatise, to say nothing 6th ed.
of its deficiencies, can be mentioned in a history of N. T. Grammar only as a weak performance. It serves to remind us, however, of the two writers mentioned above, whose very names, as well as their productions, which belong here, had fallen into almost total oblivion. The one, Casp. Wyss, Prof. of Greek in the Gymnasium of Zurich (†1659), published Dialectologia Sacra, in qua quicquid per universum N. F. contextum in apostolica et voce et phrasi a communi Graecor. lingua eoque grammatica analogia discrepat, methodo congrua disponitur, accurate definitur et omnium sacri contextus exemplorum inductione illustratur. Tigur. 1650. pp. 324 (besides the appendix), small 8vo. In this treatise the grammatical peculiarities of N. T. diction are arranged under the following heads: Dialectus Attica, Ionica, Dorica, Aeolica, Boeotica, Poetica, Ἑβραΐζουσα. This arrangement is awkward in the extreme, since kindred topics are separated and frequently are discussed in four different places. The writer's acquaintance with the Greek dialects, also, was clearly not beyond the ordinary scholarship of his time, as the very mention of a special dialectus poetica shows, and an examination of what he calls Attic renders still more manifest. Still, as a collection of examples, which in several sections is absolutely complete, the volume has value; and as respects the grammatical Hebraisms of the N. T. the author's moderation might well have been imitated by his contemporaries.

George Pasor, Prof. of Greek at Franeker (†1637), known by his small Lexicon of the N. T., — which has been several times republished, finally by J. F. Fischer, — left among his papers a grammar of the N. T., which his son, Matthias Pasor, Prof. of Theology at Gröningen (†1658), pub-

The Greek erudition of *J. F. Hombergk*, in his Parerga Sacra. Amstel. 1719. 4to., and of *H. Heisen*, in his Novae Hypotheses Interpretandae felicius Ep. Jacobi. Brem. 1739. 4to., is lexical rather than grammatical.

[1] In Dathe's edition this Grammatica Sacra forms, as is well known, the *first* book.

18 lished, with additions and improvements of his own, under the following title: G. Pasoris Grammatica Graeca Sacra N. T. in tres libros distributa. 6 Gröning. 1655. pp. 787. 8vo. This work is now a literary rarity,[1] though 7th ed. it is far more fitted than the Lexicon to transmit the author's name to posterity. It is divided, as the title indicates, into three books. The first contains the Inflections; the second, the Syntax (244–530); the third, seven appendices: de nominibus N. T., de verbis N. T., de verbis anomalis, de dialectis N. T., de accentibus, de praxi grammaticae, de numeris s. arithmetica graeca. The second book and the Appendix de dialectis N. T.[2] are the most valuable portions of the work. For in the first book, and in 6 most of the appendices which form the third, he treats of the ordinary 8th ed. subjects of a general Greek grammar, superfluously inserting e.g. full paradigms of the Greek nouns and verbs. The syntax is elaborated with great accuracy and copiousness. The writer points out what is Hebraistic, but seldom adduces parallels from native Greek authors. This useful volume, however, is without a full index.

During the interval from Pasor to Haab, the Grammar of the N. T. was treated but incidentally in treatises on the style of the N. T., e.g. by Leusden (de Dialectis N. T.) and Olearius (de Stylo N. T., pp. 257–271). But these authors confined themselves almost exclusively to Hebraisms, and by representing as Hebraistic much pure Greek phraseology, they involved in confusion again the whole inquiry concerning the Grammar of the N. T. Georgi was the first to vindicate the Greek character of numerous constructions usually regarded as Hebraistic, although even he did not escape one-sidedness. His writings attracted but little attention; while the works of Vorst and Leusden now obtained through the efforts of Fischer new currency, and Storr's well-known book[3] was allowed for many years to exert its pernicious influence on the interpretation of the N. T. without restraint.

From the school of Storr appeared Ph. H. Haab (rector of Schweigern, in the kingdom of Würtemberg, †1833) with his Hebrew-Greek Grammar of the N. T., prefaced by F. G. v. Süskind. Tübing. 1815. 8vo. Overlooking the pure Greek element in the N. T. diction, he directed his

[1] Even *Foppen* (Bibliotheca Belgica, Tom. I. p. 342), who gives a list of Pasor's other writings, does not mention this work. *Salthen*, Cat. Biblioth. Lib. Rar. (Regiom. 1751. 8vo.) p. 470, bears witness to its extreme rarity, and *D. Gerdesius*, in his Florileg. Hist. Crit. Libr. Rar. (Gröning. 1763. 8vo.) p. 272.

[2] Pasor had already himself added this appendix, under the title Idea (syllabus brevis) Graecar. N. T. Dialectorum, to the first edition of his Syllabus Graeco-Lat. omnium N. T. vocum. Amstel. 1632. 12mo. At the end he promises the above full Grammatica N. T.

[3] Observatt. ad analog. et syntaxin Hebr. Stuttg. 1779. 8vo. Some acute grammatical observations, especially on enallage temporum, particularum, and the like, are to be found in *J. G. Straube*, diss. de emphasi graecae linguae N. T. in *v. d. Honert*, p. 70 sqq.

attention merely to grammatical Hebraisms, and in the arrangement of the whole he followed the works of Storr and Weckherlin (Hebr. Gram. 19
2 Pts.). If the reviewer in Bengel's Archiv (1 B. S. 406 ff.) is to be credited, "the author has accomplished his task with such diligence, such sound judgment, such accuracy, and such nice and comprehensive knowledge of language, as must obtain for it the approbation of all friends of 7
the well-grounded interpretation of the N. T." A very different and 7th ed.
almost entirely opposite opinion has been expressed, however, by two scholars who must be regarded as most competent and impartial judges in this department: in the n. theol. Annal. 1816. 2 B. S. 859–879, and (by deWette?) in the A. LZ. 1816. N. 39–41. S. 305–326. After long and various use of the book, I am compelled to say that I entirely concur in their decision. The principal fault of the book consists in the author's not having correctly distinguished the classic Greek element from the Hebraistic in the diction of the N. T., and in his having consequently adduced as Hebraistic much either that is common to all cultivated languages, or that occurs as frequently in the classics as in the N. T.; while from his partiality to Storr's views, he has quite misinterpreted numerous passages of the N. T. by forcing Hebraisms upon them (see proof below). Moreover, the book is full of confusion, the matter is arranged most 7
arbitrarily, and the whole begins with a section on Tropes! — a subject 6th ed.
not belonging to Grammar at all. The last of the reviewers mentioned above does not, accordingly, seem too severe in concluding his criticism with these words: "Seldom have we met a work which was so complete a failure as this, and against the use of which we must warn the public so emphatically."

§ 4. Further, the detached grammatical remarks in commentaries on the books of the N. T., in miscellanies, and in exegetical monographs, though sometimes exhibiting creditable research, failed to furnish, all taken together, a complete discussion of the Grammar of the N. T. These contributions, moreover, were rendered useless by that uncritical empiricism which controlled Greek Philology till the beginning of the present century, and Hebrew till a much more recent period; just as this same empiricism has imparted to the interpretation of the N. T. the impress of uncertainty and arbitrariness. The philosophical method of handling philological subjects, — that method which seeks in national and individual peculiarities of thought the grounds of all phenomena of speech, anomalies even not excepted, — has effected a complete revolution in the study of Greek; and the application of the same method to the language of the N. T. can alone invest the Grammar 20
of the N. T. with a scientific character, and elevate it to the dignity of a safe guide in interpretation.

The empiricism that pervaded Greek philology manifested itself in the department of Grammar mainly in the following particulars: a. The grammatical structure of the language was apprehended merely in the rudest outline; hence the relation of kindred forms, e.g. of the Aor. and Perf., of the Subjunctive and the Optative, of the twofold order of negatives (*οὐ* and *μή*), matters in which the genius of the Greek language is especially conspicuous, was left quite uncertain. b. In regard to those forms the
8 distinctive power of which had been in general discerned, an unlimited
7th ed. interchange was asserted, according to which, one tense, one case, one particle, was used for another; and even direct opposites (e.g. Pret. and Fut., *ἀπό* and *πρός*, etc.) were supposed to be interchanged. c. A multitude of ellipses was devised, and in the most simple expression something was said to be understood. This method of procedure, still exhibited in Fischer's copious Animad. ad Welleri Grammat. Gr. (Lips. 1798 ff. 3 Spec. 8vo.), was applied by expositors to the N. T. They thought themselves warranted in using still greater liberties than Greek philologists, because the Hebrew, after which the diction of the N. T. was modelled, is characterized by want of precision in forms, and want of regularity in syntax, (which, therefore, was not treated systematically but only under the head
8 of enallages and solecisms).[1] The natural consequences of such views were
6th ed. abundantly apparent in the N. T. commentaries of the time; and Storr[2] had the honor of reducing to a sort of system this farrago of grammatical empiricism. Apart from all other evils resulting from such principles, they afforded unbounded license to the caprice of expositors, and made it
21 easy for them to discover in the words of the sacred authors sentiments quite contradictory.[3]

[1] This empiricism was but occasionally and partially combated by enlightened scholars. Thus numerous misapprehensions of expositors were pointed out, very intelligently on the whole, by the Wittenberg professors *Balth. Stolberg*, in his Tractat. de soloecism. et barbarism. graecae N. F. dictioni falso tributis. Vit. (1681.) 1685. 4to., and *Franz Woken*, in his dissertation entitled: Pietas critica in hypallagas bibl. Viteb. 1718. 8vo., and particularly in his Enallagae e N. T. graeci textus praecipuis et plurimis locis exterminatae. Viteb. 1730. 8vo. Also *J. Conr. Schwarz* evinces highly respectable research and judgment in his Lib. de opinatis discipulor. Chr. soloecismis. Cob. 1730. 4to. Such protests, however, either obtained no attention, or were drowned by a *contorte! artificiose!*

[2] How entirely different from his acute countryman *Alb. Bengel*, in his Gnomon, who, though he is often drawn into over-refined expositions, and attributes to the apostles *his own* dialectic conceptions, might have served for years as a model of careful and instructive exposition. While he turned attention to grammatical inquiries (cf. e.g. Acts iii. 19; xxvi. 2; 1 Cor. xii. 15; Matt. xviii. 17; Heb. vi. 4.), he devoted special diligence in lexical matters to synonyms.

[3] Sunt, says *Tittmann* (de scriptor. N. T. diligentia gramm. Lips. 1813. 4to., in Synonym. N. T. I. p. 206), qui grammaticarum legum observationem in N. T. interpretatione parum curent et, si scriptoris cujusdam verba grammatice i.e. ex legibus linguae explicata sententiam ..... ab ipsorum opinione alienam prodant, nullam illarum legum rationem habeant, sed propria verborum vi neglecta scriptorem dixisse

The Greek philologists were the first to abandon this empiricism. Reitz's pupil, Gottfr. Hermann, by his work De Emendanda Ratione Grammaticae Gr., gave the first powerful impulse to the *rational*[1] investigation of the noble Greek tongue. This method has now, after the lapse of more than fifty years, become so general, and produced such important 9
results, and of late has allied itself so successfully to historical[2] research, 7.h ed.
that Greek grammar has become transformed. The treatment of the subject has been *rational*, because

a. The primary import of all grammatical forms (the cases, tenses, moods), that is, the notion corresponding to every such form in the Greek mind, was distinctly settled; and to this primary notion all actual uses of the same form were referred. Thus a multitude of ellipses disappeared, and enallage was reduced within its natural and narrow bounds.

b. Even in the case of such deviations from the established laws of the language as had been adopted, either generally or by individual authors, — anacoluthon, confusio duarum structurarum, attractio, constructio ad sensum, brachylogia, etc., — pains were taken to show how they originated in the mind of the speaker or writer.

The Greek language is thus exhibited as the expression of Greek thought 9
— as a *living* idiom. Every form and turn of expression is not merely 6th ed.
stated as a matter of fact, but is traced back to the thinking mind, and an attempt is made to comprehend it in its origin within the soul. By such a method every unintelligible usage disappears of itself, such as the assumption that a writer wishing to express a *past* event has employed a *fut.* tense; that intending to say *out of*, he has said *at;* that wishing to call some one *learned*, he has called him *more learned;* that meaning to subjoin a *cause*, he has written *consequently;* that desirous of saying *I saw* a *man*, he has said *I saw* the *man*, etc.

For a long time, however, Biblical philologists took no notice of all this 22
progress in Greek grammar (and lexicography). They clung to old Viger and to Storr, and kept aloof from classical philology, under the impression (by no one distinctly avowed, to be sure, in recent times) that N. T. Greek, because Hebraistic, could not be subjected to the same philosophical method of inquiry. They would not perceive that Hebrew itself, like every other human language, admits and requires a philosophical treatment. Through the persevering efforts of Ewald, this truth is now universally acknowledged. No one now denies that the ultimate explanation of Hebrew modes of expression must be sought for in Hebrew modes of

contendant, *quae talibus verbis nemo sana mente praeditus dicere unquam potuit. Hermann's* (ad Vig. 788) satirical remarks were just.

[1] I should prefer this epithet to *philosophical*, because the latter may easily give rise to misunderstanding. All merely empirical philology is irrational; it regards language as something merely external, and not as the expression of thought. Cf. *Tittmann*, as above, S. 205 sq.

[2] *G. Bernhardy*, wissenschaftl. Syntax der griech. Sprache. Berl. 1829. 8vo.

thought, and that a simple-minded people would be the last to repudiate
10 the fundamental principles of human speech.[1] Scholars are no longer con-
7th ed. tent to give a preposition, for instance, the most diverse meanings according to the assumed requirements of a context superficially examined. But an endeavor is made to point out the transition from the primary import of every particle to every one of its secondary meanings; and without this, every alleged signification is regarded as an unscientific assumption. A student is no longer satisfied with the vague remark that to a Hebrew, *non omnis* — which in reason can only mean *not every one* — is the same as *omnis non*, that is, *nullus;* on the contrary, he refers to the true principle in every such case to be kept in view.

N. T. Grammar, therefore, must strive after a *rational* exposition of the language of the N. T. if it will attain a scientific basis itself, or secure the same in turn to exegesis. All that has been already achieved in Greek
10 philology must be carefully turned to account. It must, however, be
6th ed. remembered, that not every nice distinction propounded by the linguists is to be viewed as established (and even the text perhaps altered accordingly), but that philology is constantly progressive. Many views have already required to be considerably modified (those, for instance, relating to the use of ἐἰ with the subjunctive); others are still matters of disputation even among the best scholars (for instance, certain uses of ἄν).

23 Since 1824, N. T. Grammar in particular has received valuable contributions from Fritzsche, in his Dissertatt. in 2 Epist. ad Cor. (Lips. 1824.), in his Commentaries on Matthew and Mark, in his Conject. in N. T. Lips. 1825. 2 Spec. 8vo., and especially in his Comment. on the Epistle to the Romans, Hal. 1836. 8vo. To these must be added the Dissertations of Gieseler and Bornemann in Rosenmüller's Exeget. Repert. 2 B., as well as the latter's Scholia in Lucae Evang. Lips. 1830. 8vo., and, in part, his edition of the Acts of the Apostles (Acta Apost. ad Cod. Cantabrig. fidem rec. et interpr. est. Grossenhain, 1848. 8vo. I.). Finally, many grammatical questions have been discussed in the controversial correspondence between Fritzsche and Tholuck.[2]

[1] Rational investigation must be founded on historical. The whole field of language must first be historically surveyed, before we can explain individual phenomena. A simple language supposes simplicity of thought; and the explanation of forms and expressions is more easy in Hebrew, than in languages of less simplicity. The rational investigation of Hebrew implies tracing out all transitions from one signification of a word to another, all constructions and turns of expression, as they occurred in the Hebrew mind; since language is merely the image of thought (as thinking is, according to the Hebrew view itself, unuttered speech). To attempt to delineate *a priori* the laws of language is absurd. It is readily conceded that the rational method of investigation may be now and then misapplied, as even the Greek philologists have not escaped over-refinements. Adherence, however, to empirical stupidity from the apprehension of such danger is disgraceful.

[2] *Fritzsche,* Ueber die Verdienste D. Tholuck's um die Schrifterklärung. Halle. 1831. 8vo. *Tholuck,* Beiträge zur Spracherklärung des N. T. Halle. 1832. 8vo. *Fritzsche,*

Philological investigation into the language of the N. T. has not remained wholly without influence [1] on any of the numerous commentaries which have recently appeared, whether emanating from the critical, evangelical, or philosophical school of theology; although but a few of them 11
have treated philological points attentively and independently (as van 7th ed
Hengel, Lücke, Bleek, Meyer). An intelligent estimate of improved philological principles in their application to the N. T., has been given by H. G. Hölemann, Comment. de interpretatione sacra cum profana feliciter conjungenda. Lips. 1832. 8vo.

N. T. Grammar has recently found its way from Germany to England and North America; partly in a translation of the fourth edition of the present book (New York and London, 1840), and partly in a separate (original ?) work, entitled, A Greek Grammar to the N. T., etc., by the Rev. William Trollope, M.A. London, 1842. 8vo. An earlier work on this subject, entitled, A Grammar of the N. T. Dialect, by Moses Stuart. Andover. 1841. 8vo., I have not yet seen. Moreover, the special grammatical characteristics of individual writers have begun to attract attention (yet see above, p. 4): Gl. Ph. Ch. Kaiser, Diss. de Speciali Joa. Ap. Grammatica Culpa Negligentiae liberanda. Erlang. 1842. II. 4to.; also De Speciali Petri Ap. Grammatica Culpa Negligentiae liberanda. Erlang. 1848. 4to.

[In Germany, too, works upon N. T. Grammar have since been issued by Alex. Buttmann (Grammatik des N. T. Sprachgebrauchs. Im Anschlusse an Ph. Buttmann's griech. Grammatik. Berl. 1859. 8vo.) and S. Ch. Schirlitz (Grundzüge der N. T. Gräcität nach den besten Quellen für Studirende der Theol. u. Philol. Giessen. 1861. 8vo.).]

Präliminarien zur Abbitte und Ehrenerklärung, die ich gern dem D. Tholuck gewähren möchte. Halle. 1832. 8vo. *Tholuck*, Noch ein ernstes Wort an D. Fritzsche. Halle. 1832. 8vo. *Tholuck* laid more stress on philological investigation in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. Hamb. 1836, 1840, 1850. 8vo. The anonymous author of Beiträge zur Erklärung des Br. an die Hebr. Leipz. 1840. 8vo., passes a severe judgment rather on the hermeneutical than the grammatical merits of Tholuck.

[1] Even on the commentaries of the excellent BCrusius, whose weakest side is undoubtedly the philological

12
7th ed.
11
6th ed.
25

PART I.

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION, ESPECIALLY IN ITS GRAMMATICAL ASPECTS.

§ 1. VARIOUS OPINIONS CONCERNING THE CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION.

1. THOUGH the character of the N. T. diction is pretty distinct and obvious, Biblical philologists long entertained erroneous, or at least imperfect and one-sided, views on the subject. For, dogmatic considerations, combined with ignorance of later Greek dialectology, rendered minds in other respects intelligent incapable of perceiving exegetical truth.

From the beginning of the 17th century various distinguished scholars (Purists) repeatedly attempted to demonstrate that the style of the N. T. reaches in every respect the standard of classical purity and elegance; while others (Hebraists) not only recognized its Hebrew coloring, but in part at least grossly exaggerated it. Towards the end of the 17th century the opinion of the Hebraists obtained the ascendancy; though it did not altogether suppress that of the Purists, which found very learned defenders. About the middle of the 18th century, however, the Purist party became extinct, and the principles of the Hebraists, slightly modified in some particulars, became universal. Not until very lately have scholars begun to perceive the one-sidedness of these principles, and to adopt the correct intermediate views which Beza and H. Stephanus had already in the main pointed out.

The history of the various opinions which from time to time were advanced, often with great controversial bitterness, respecting the Greek style of the N. T., is briefly related in Morus, Acroas. acad. sup. Hermeneut. N. T., ed. Eichstädt, Tom. i. p. 216 sqq.; in Meyer, Gesch. der Schrifterklär. iii. 342 ff. (cf. Eichstädt, Pr. sententiar. de dictione scriptor. N. T. brevis censura. Jen. 1845. 4to.); with several important inaccuracies, in Planck, Einleit. in d. theol. Wissensch. ii. 43 ff. (cf. Stange, theol. Symmikta,

ii. 295 ff.). For the bibliography of the subject see Walch, biblioth. theol. 13
iv. 276 sqq.[1] From these sources, with occasional corrections, we present 7th ed.
the following remarks as sufficient for our purpose: 12
6th ed.

Th. Beza, in his Digressio de dono linguarum et apostol. sermone (on Acts x. 46), in reply to Erasmus's assertion Apostolorum sermo non solum 26
impolitus et inconditus verum etiam imperfectus et perturbatus, aliquoties plane soloecissans, defended the simplicity and force of the N. T. diction; and its Hebraisms in particular, which, as is well known, he was far from denying, he represented in a very advantageous light as ejusmodi, ut nullo alio idiomate tam feliciter exprimi possint, imo interdum ne exprimi quidem, — in fact as gemmae, quibus (apostoli) scripta sua exornarint. After him, H. Stephanus, in the preface to his edition of the N. T. of 1576, combated the views of those qui in his scriptis inculta omnia et horrida esse putant; and labored to show, by specimens, what fine Greek turns of expression occur in the style of the N. T., and that even the admixture of Hebraisms imparts to it inimitable force and expressiveness.

Though the beauties pointed out are rhetorical rather than linguistic, and the Hebraisms are overrated, yet the judgment of these two masters of Greek is not so one-sided as it is generally said to be, and on the whole comes nearer the truth than that of many later expositors.

After Drusius and Glass had specified and explained Hebraisms in the N. T. without opposition, extravagant notions were first promulgated by Seb. Pfochen, in his Diatribe de linguae graecae N. T. puritate (Amst. 1629; ed. 2, 1633. 12mo.). Having in the preface stated the subject of his inquiry to be: an stylus N. T. sit vere graecus nec ab aliorum Graecorum stylo alienior talisque, qui ab Homero, Demosthene aliisque Graecis intelligi potuisset §§ 81–129, he endeavors to demonstrate by copious quotations, graecos autores profanos eisdem phrasibus et verbis loquutos esse, quibus scriptores N. T. (§ 29). This juvenile treatise (though in substance approved by Erasmus Schmid, as afterwards appeared from his Opus posthumum, 1658) seems, with its strict Purism, to have produced at the time no great impression.

The Hamburg rector Joach. Junge (1637, 1639) in reality, though indirectly, first gave rise to a *controversy* on the nature of the N. T. diction. 27
His opponent, the Hamburg pastor Jac. Grosse (1640), though not endors- 14
ing Junge's real opinion respecting the Hellenism (not barbarism)[2] of the 7th ed.

[1] See also *Baumgarten*, Polemik, iii. 176 ff. The opinions of the (apologetical) Fathers on the style of the N. T. are given summarily in *J. Lami*, de erudit. apostolor. p. 138 sqq. They treat the subject less under a philological than a rhetorical point of view. Theodoret, gr. affect. cur. s., triumphantly opposes the σολοικισμοὶ ἁλιευτικοί to the ξυλλογισμοὶ ἀττικοί.

[2] Junge himself thus states his true opinion, in a German memorial addressed to the Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs in 1637 [cf. Joach. Jungius Ueber die Originalsprache des N. T. vom Jahre 1637. Aufgefunden, zuerst herausgegeben und eingeleitet von *Joh. Geffcken*. Hamb. 1863. 8vo.]: I have distinctly said, and I still say, that the style

13 N. T. style, admitted its harmlessness.[1] Dan. Wulfer, however, came
6th ed. forward the same year with Innocentia Hellenistarum vindicata (see 1, etc.), in which he asserted that Grosse's reasoning was neither clear nor convincing.[2] Grosse had now to contend against Wulfer, whose misunderstandings he exposed, and also against Joh. Musaeus, the theologian of Jena (1641–42), who had charged him with vacillation and contradiction, but had in view rather his doctrinal opinions (respecting verbal inspiration); so that Grosse published, in all, five short dissertations (1641–42), vindicating, not indeed the Grecian elegance, but the purity and dignity of the language of the N. T.

Without mingling in these controversies, which descended into odious personalities and were nearly fruitless to science, Dan. Heinsius (1643) asserted the Hellenism of the N. T. diction; and Thom. Gataker (de novi instrum. stylo dissert. 1648) wrote expressly against the Purism of Pfochen, with learning, but not without exaggeration. Joh. Vorst now published (1658, 1665) an elaborate and perspicuous list of the Hebraisms of the N. T. which Hor. Vitringa shortly afterwards animadverted upon as highly partial.[3]

J. H. Böcler (1641) and J. Olearius (1668)[4] adopted intermediate views, carefully discriminating between the Greek and the Hebrew elements in
28 the style of the N. T., and J. Leusden agreed with them in the main, although he is inferior to Olearius in discretion.

of the N. T. is not classical Greek. . . . . The question an N. T. scateat barbarismis, is so outrageous, that no Christian man ever entertained it before; . . . . . I never could be brought to admit that there are barbarous expressions in the N. T., because the Greeks themselves regard a barbarism as a vitium.

[1] His two leading positions are thus expressed: quod quamvis evangelistae et apostoli in N. T. non adeo ornato et nitido, tumido et affectato (!) dicendi genere usi sint . . . . . impium tamen, imo blasphemum sit, si quis inde S. literarum studiosus graecum stylum . . . . . sugillare, vilipendere et juventuti suspectum facere ipsique vitia et notam soloecismorum et barbarismorum attricare contendat . . . . . Quod nec patres, qui soloecismorum et barbarismorum meminerunt et apostolos idiotas fuisse scripserunt, nec illi autores, qui stylum N. T. hellenisticum esse statuerunt, nec isti, qui in N. T. Ebraismos et Chaldaismos esse observarunt, stylum S. apostolorum contemserint, sugillarint eumq. impuritatis alicujus accusarint cet.

[2] *Grosse's* dissertation was specially directed against a possible inference from the proposition that the N. T. is not written in so good Greek as that employed by native Greek authors; and, essentially, refers to adversaries that (at least in Hamburg) had then no existence. Moreover his whole argument is rather of a negative kind, as appears for example from the résumé (p. 40 of *Grosse's* Trias): etiamsi graecus stylus apostolor. non sit tam ornatus et affectatus, ut fuit ille qui fuit florente Graecia, non atticus ut Athenis, non doricus ut Corinthi, non ionicus ut Ephesi, non aeolicus ut Troade, fuit tamen vere graecus ab omni soloecismorum et barbarismorum labe immunis.

[3] *Vorst* in the preface utters his conviction: sacros codices N. T. talibus et vocabulis et phrasibus, quae hebraeam linguam sapiant, *scatere plane*. Cf. further, his Cogitata de stylo N. T., prefixed to Fischer's edition of the work de Hebraismis.

[4] *J. Coccejî* stricturae in Pfochen. diatrib. were first printed solely for private distribution, and afterwards published in *Rhenferd's* collection.

It now came to be very generally admitted that Hebraisms constitute a prominent element in N. T. diction, and give it a coloring, not indeed barbarous, but widely removed from classic purity (see also Werenfels, Opusc. i. p. 311 sqq.).[1] The same view was advanced by Mos. Solanus, in a tardy but very sensible pamphlet against Pfochen. Even J. Heinr. Michaelis (1707) and Ant. Blackwall (1727) did not presume to deny the existence of Hebraisms, but tried to prove that the style of the N. T. writers, notwithstanding the Hebraisms, has all the properties of an elegant style, and in this respect is not inferior to the purity of the classics. The last-named scholar begins his work, which abounds in excellent remarks, thus: tantum abest, ut hebraismos in N. T. reperiri infitiemur, ut eorum potius insignem, qua hic divinus abundat liber, copiam *ad commoditatem ejus et elegantiam majorem afferre accessionem arbitremur*. As little effect, however, had these scholars on the now established opinion as the erudite Ch. Siegm. Georgi, who, in his Vindiciae N. T. ab Ebraismis (1732), returned to the strongest Purism; and in a new work, Hierocriticus sacer (1733), defended his assertions. He was followed, but with no greater success, by J. Conr. Schwarz, whose Commentarii crit. et philol. linguae gr. N. T. Lips. 1736. 4to., chiefly aimed at demonstrating the Greek purity even of expressions taken for Hebraisms.[2] To these must be added, as the last who opposed the misuse of Hebraisms, El. Palairet (observatt. philol. crit. in N. T. L. B. 1752. 8vo.),[3] and H. W. van Marle (florileg. observ. in epp. apost. L. B. 1758. 8vo.). Through the influence of the school of Ernesti, the more correct estimate of the language of the N. T. was generally diffused over Germany.[4] Cf. Ernesti's Institut. Interpret. i. 2. cap. 3.

15 7th ed. 14 6th ed.

[1] *Hemsterhuis* ad Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3: eorum, qui orationem N. T. graecam esse castigatissimam contendunt, opinio perquam mihi semper ridicula fuit visa. Also, *Blth. Stolberg*, de soloecismis et barbarismis N. T. Viteb. 1681. 4to. and 1685. 4to., wished merely to vindicate the N. T. diction from blemishes unjustly ascribed to it; but, in fact, attempted to explain away many real Hebraisms.

[2] In the anticipation of certain victory he says in p. 8 of his preface: olim hebraismi, syrismi, chaldaismi, rabinismi (sic !), latinismi cet. celebrabantur nomina, ut vel scriptores sacri suam graecae dictionis ignorantiam prodere aut in graeco sermone tot linguarum notitiam ostentasse viderentur vel saltem interpretes illorum literatissimi et singularum locutionum perspicacissimi judicarentur. Sed *conata haec ineptiarum et vanitatis ita sunt etiam a nobis convicta*, ut si qui cet. A satire on the Purists will be found in Somnium in quo praeter cetera genius sec. vapulat. Alteburg. 1761, p. 97 sqq.

[3] Supplements by Pal. himself may be seen in the Biblioth. Brem. nova Cl. 3 and 4. On the whole, Pal. produces passages almost exclusively in defence of such significations and phrases, as no judicious person would take to be Hebraisms.

[4] *Ernesti's* view of the N. T. diction (diss. de difficult. interpret. grammat. N. T. § 12) may be recalled here: genus orationis in libris N. T. esse e pure graecis et ebraicam maxime consuetudinem referentibus verbis formulisque dicendi mixtum et temperatum, id quidem adeo evidens est iis, qui satis graece sciunt, *ut plane misericordia digni sint, qui omnia bene graeca esse contendant.*

29 Most of the above-mentioned old dissertations (besides others), written
16 in the Purist controversy, are collected in J. Rhenferd's Dissertatt. philolog.
7th ed. theolog. de Stylo N. T. syntagma, Leov. 1702. 4to., and in (what may be considered as a supplement to Rhenferd's collection) Taco Hajo van den Honert, Syntagma dissertatt. de stylo N. T. graeco. Amst. 1703. 4to.[1]

15 Let us endeavor briefly to characterize the efforts of those who attrib-
6th ed. uted classical purity to the N. T. diction.[2]

Their great object was to collect from native Greek authors passages in which those very same words and phrases occur which are found in the N. T., and are there explained as Hebraisms. Now, apart from the circumstance that what is strictly speaking the body of the language was not in general distinguished from the rhetorical element, the Purists entirely overlooked the following considerations:

a. That numerous expressions and phrases (particularly such as are figurative), owing to their simplicity and naturalness, are common to all, or at least to many languages, and cannot with propriety be called either Grecisms or Hebraisms.[3]

b. That a distinction is to be made between the diction of prose and that of poetry, and also between figurative expressions employed very rarely and by individual authors to give composition a peculiar elevation (as lumina orationis), and those which have become the common property of the language; and that, if in plain prose like that of the N. T. expressions used by Pindar, Æschylus, Euripides,[4] etc. occur, or if such expressions, as well as rare Greek figurative phrases, recur as ordinary phraseology, this by no means proves the classical purity of the N. T.

c. That when an expression is found alike in Hebrew and in Greek, the training and history of the writers of the N. T. render it in general more

[1] The dissertations of *Wulfer*, *Grosse*, and *Musaeus*, though of trifling importance compared to their size, are missed with regret from this collection, and more of *Junge's* than the sententiae doct. vir. de stylo N. T. should have been admitted. Besides, cf. *Blessig*, praesidia interpret. N. T. ex auctorib. graec. Argent. 1778. 4to., and *Mittenzwey*, locorum quorundam e Hutchinsoni ad Xenoph. Cyrop. notis, quib. purum et elegans N. T. dicendi genus defenditur, refutatio. Coburg. 1763. 4to. An essay by *G. C. Draudius*, de stylo N. T., in the Primitt. Alsfeld., Nürnb. 1736. 8vo., I have not seen; (see *Neubauer*, Nachr. von jetzt lebenden Theol. i. 253 ff.).

[2] *Mittenzwey* made some remarks on this in his Essay, already mentioned.

[3] Simplicity and graphic expression are common to Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek with the diction of Homer; and particular phrases having these characteristics could with as little propriety be called Hebraisms in the latter as Grecisms in the former. In general, languages have points of contact, especially in *popular* speech, which is universally simple and graphic; while cultivated diction, as it is coined by the learned, is more isolated. Hence in Latin, for instance, most of what are called Germanisms are to be found in the style of comedies, epistles, etc.

[4] See, on the other hand, *Krebs*, observ. praef. p. 3. *Leusden*, de dialectt. p. 37, says, with great absurdity: nos non fugit, carmina istorum hominum (tragicor.) innumeris hebraismis esse contaminata. Accordingly *Fischer*, ad Leusden, p. 114, finds Hebraisms in the poems of Homer.

probable that such expression is copied immediately from the Hebrew, than that it is borrowed from the choicer literary language of Greece. 30
Not to mention,

d. That those uncritical collectors huddled together many passages out of Greek authors where, *α.* the same word indeed occurs, but in a different 17
signification; or, *β.* expressions are found only similar, not identical. 7th ed.
Further,

e. That they unhesitatingly used even the Byzantine writers, into whose language, through the influence of the church, many elements of the Hebraizing N. T. phraseology may have been transferred (as in particular 16
instances can be proved to be extremely probable; cf. Niebuhr, Index to 6th ed.
Agath. under *ζημιοῦσθαι*); and, at all events, these Byzantine authors are not standards of classic Greek purity. Finally,

f. That they passed over, and were forced to pass over, many expressions in silence, because they are undeniable Hebraisms.[1]

Thus the evidence produced in favor of Purism was partly defective and partly irrelevant. Besides, most of the Purists restricted themselves mainly to the lexical side of the question; Georgi alone discussed the grammatical with a fulness sustained by stores of erudition.

In proof of the preceding statements, we subjoin several striking examples (cf. also Mori acroas. l. c. p. 222 sqq.): And as respects

a. Matt. v. 6, *πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες τὴν δικαιοσύνην.* Examples are produced from Xenophon, Æschines, Lucian, Artemidorus, to prove that *διψῆν*, in this (figurative) sense, is pure Greek. But it is so used in Latin also, and in nearly all languages; it cannot, therefore, be regarded as a Grecism any more than a Hebraism. The same holds of *ἐσθίειν* (*κατεσθίειν*) in the figurative sense of *consume, waste.* This cannot be proved from Iliad 23, 182 to be a Grecism, nor from Deut. xxxii. 22 etc. to be a Hebraism; but it is common to all languages. In the same way we might dispense with parallels to *γενεά generation* i.e. the individuals of a particular generation (Georgi, Vind. p. 39), to *χείρ power*, to *ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας*, and the like. And it is really ridiculous when Matt. x. 27 *κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων* is authenticated by Æsop. 139, 1, *ἔριφος ἐπί τινος δώματος ἑστώς.* Pfochen's dissertation contains a great number of such idle and preposterous remarks.

b. That *κοιμᾶσθαι* signifies *mori* is proved from the Iliad 11, 241 (Georgi, vind. p. 122 sqq.) *κοιμήσατο χάλκεον ὕπνον*, and Soph. Electr. 510; that *σπέρμα* is used also by the Greeks for *proles* is proved chiefly from the poets, as Eurip. Iph. Aul. 524; Iph. Taur. 987; Hec. 254, and Soph. Electr. 1508 (Georgi, vind. p. 87 sqq.); that *ποιμαίνειν* means *regere*, from Anacr. 57, 8; that *ἰδεῖν* and *θεωρεῖν θάνατον* are good Greek, from 31
Soph. Elect. 205 (Schwarz, Comm. p. 410), or from *δέρκεσθαι κτύπον*,

[1] This applies also to *J. E. Ostermann*, whose Positiones philologicae graecum N. T. contextum concernentes have been reprinted in *Crenii* exercitatt. fasc. ii. p. 485 sqq.

σκότον, in tragedians. For ποτήριον πίνειν in a figurative sense (Matt. xx. 22), Schwarz quotes Æschyl. Agam. 1397. That πίπτειν signifies *irritum esse*, the established meaning in Hebrew, the same writer proves by Plato's figurative expression, δοκεῖ ἡδονή σοι πεπτωκέναι καθαπερεὶ πληγεῖσα ὑπὸ τῶν νῦν δὴ λόγων, Phileb. p. 22. e.

c. The phrase γινώσκειν ἄνδρα, though not unknown in Greek (Jacobs,
18 ad Philostr. imagg. p. 583), may be derived with assurance directly from
7th ed. the common Hebrew phrase יָדַע אִישׁ, and regarded in our authors as a Hebraism. In like manner σπλάγχνα *compassion*, ξηρά *land* as opposed to water (Fischer ad Leusden dialectt. 31), χεῖλος in the sense of *shore*, στόμα for *edge* of a sword (cf., however, Boissonade, Nic. p. 282), παχύνειν *to be stupid, foolish*, κύριος κυρίων, εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον are primarily,
17 no doubt, copied from the Hebrew, and are not to be proved to be pure
6th ed. Greek by parallels from Herodot., Ælian, Xenophon, Diodor. Sic., Philostratus, and others.

d. α. That ἐν is used by Greek authors to express the *casus instrumentalis* — which with certain limitations is true — Pfochen tries to prove by such quotations as: πλέων ἐν ταῖς ναυσί (Xenoph.), ἦλθε ..... ἐν νηὶ μελαίνῃ (Hesiod)! That good Greek authors use ῥῆμα for *res* is said to be apparent from Platt. legg. 797 c. (τούτου ῥήματος καὶ τοῦ δόγματος οὐκ εἶναι ζημίαν μείζω), where ῥῆμα may be translated *verdict*, decision. Χορτάζειν *to fill*, (of persons), is proved to be pure Greek from Plat. rep. 2, 372, where it refers to *swine!* Ζητεῖν ψυχήν τινος is affirmed to be classical, from Eur. Io. 1112; Thuc. 6, 27, etc., where ζητεῖν alone occurs in the sense of *insidiari*, or rather *seek for* (in order to kill). That ὀφείλημα in good Greek signifies *peccatum*, Schwarz tries to prove by Plat. Cratyl. 400 c., where, however, ὀφειλόμενα denotes as elsewhere *debita*. Equally inappropriate are most of the passages from which Georgi (Hierocrit. p. 36 sq., 186 sq.) attempts to show that in the best Greek authors the prepositions εἰς and ἐν are interchanged, as they are in the N. T. Cf. also Krebs, Obs. p. 14 sq.

β. That εὑρίσκειν χάριν (ἔλεος) παρά τινι is not a Hebraism, Georgi (Vind. p. 116) tries to demonstrate from a passage of Demosthenes containing the words εὑρίσκεσθαι τὴν εἰρήνην, τὴν δωρεάν, as if the Hebraism in question did not lie rather in the whole phrase (for there is nothing peculiar to Hebrew in using *find* for *obtain*), and as if nothing depended on the middle voice. Palairet quotes Aristoph. Acharn. κρατὴρ αἵματος, and similar expressions, to justify the use of ποτήριον for *sors;* and Schwarz defends πίπτειν *irritum esse* by a reference to Plat. Euthyphr. 14 d. οὐ χαμαὶ πεσεῖται ὅ,τι ἂν εἴποις. Passages containing the words οὔτε μέγα οὔτε σμικρόν were quoted to show that the well-known *Merismus* ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου is pure Greek (Georgi, Vind. p. 310 sqq.; Schwarz, Comment. p. 917; cf. Schäfer, Julian. p. xxi.). In such *Merismus* itself,
32 however, there is nothing Hebraistic, but only in the particular formula

given above ἀπὸ μικρ. ἕως μεγ. Theophan. Cont. p. 615 Bekk. is the first writer in whom this form occurs. Καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας, ὀσφύος, Georgi (Vind. p. 304) supports by passages in which καρπός alone is used to denote the fruit of the human body. Aristoph. Nub. πλέον πλέον, *more and more*, is not sufficient to prove that δύο δύο, *two and two*, is a Grecism; it would be necessary to produce examples where the repeated cardinal is employed for ἀνὰ δύο, ἀνὰ τρεῖς, etc., § 37, 3. In the same way ὅσσα δ' ἀκούσας εἰσεθέμην is vainly quoted from Callimachus to prove that τιθέναι εἰς τὰ ὦτα is pure Greek, as the two phrases are essentially unlike each other. Yet such specimens might be multiplied without end. What 19
Georgi, Vind. p. 25, produces from Arrian. Epictet. in defence of ὁ ἀδελφός 7th ed.
alter, seems peculiarly ridiculous.

e. Schwarz, p. 1245, asserts, on the usage of Nicetas, the pure Greek character of the phrase στηρίζειν τὸ πρόσωπον and the word ἐνωτίζεσθαι; and Palairet proves that of ἡ ξηρά in the sense of *continent*, from Jo. Cinnam. hist. iv. p. 183. Pfochen still more oddly vindicates the use of κοινός to signify *immundus*, from Lucian, Mort. Peregrin. c. 13, where Lucian derisively employs a Judeo-Christian expression.

f. Of the numerous Hebraistic words and phrases which the Purists passed over in silence, it will suffice to mention: πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, σὰρξ 18
καὶ αἷμα, υἱὸς εἰρήνης, ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐξ ὀσφύος τινός, ποιεῖν ἔλεος (χάριν) μετά 6th ed.
τινος, ἀποκρίνεσθαι without a preceding question, ἐξομολογεῖσθαι θεῷ (*to praise God*) and many others; see § 3.

After Salmasius, whose work De Lingua Hellen. later scholars had quite forgotten, Sturz's dissertation De Dialecto Alexandrina (Lips. 1784, 4to., and Ger. 1788–93, 4to.), 2d enlarged ed. Lips. 1809, 8vo., led the way to a correct estimate of N. T. diction, particularly as respects its basis, the Greek. (For able observations on Sturz, see the Heidelb. Jahrb. 1810. 18 Heft, S. 266 ff.) On this subject, therefore, Keil (Lehrb. der Hermeneut. S. 11 f.), Bertholdt (Einleit. in d. Bib. 1 Th. S. 155 f.), Eichhorn (Einleit. ins N. T. 4 Bd. S. 96 ff.), and Schott (Isagoge in N. T. p. 497 sqq.) have written more satisfactorily than many earlier critics, but without exhausting the subject, and without exhibiting the requisite scientific precision. In both these respects the younger Planck has surpassed his predecessors; and (avoiding a fundamental mistake into which Sturz fell) he was the first to unfold clearly, and on the whole correctly, the character of the N. T. diction, in his De vera natura atque indole orationis graecae N. T. comment. Gott. 1810, 4to. (reprinted in Commentatt. theol. v. Rosenmüller, l. l. p. 112 sqq.). Cf. his Pr. Observatt. quaedam ad hist. verbi gr. N. T. ibid. 1821, 4to. (and in Commentatt. theol. v. Rosenmüller, l. l. p. 193 sqq.). See also (de Wette) A. Lit. Z. 1816, No. xxix. S. 306.

33 § 2. BASIS OF THE N. T. DICTION.

In the age of Alexander the Great and his successors the Greek language underwent an internal change of a double nature. On the one hand, a literary prose language was formed, which was founded on the Attic dialect, yet differed from it by adopting a common Greek element, and even admitting numerous provincialisms (ἡ κοινὴ or ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος). On the other hand, a popular spoken language arose, in which the previously distinct dialects spoken by the various Greek tribes were blended, with a
20 predominance of the Macedonic variety.[1] This latter compound,
7th ed. varying in some respects in the various provinces of Asia and Africa subjected to the Macedonian rule, constitutes the special foundation of the diction of the N. T., as it does also of the Septuagint and Apocrypha. Its peculiarities, — further modified by a disregard of nice distinctions, and by an effort after perspicuity and
19 also after commodious forms of expression, — may be fitly ranged
6th ed. under two heads: *Lexical* and *Grammatical.*

The older dissertations on Greek Dialectology, so far as regards the κοινὴ διάλεκτος in particular, are now nearly useless. The subject is well, though briefly, treated by Matthiae (ausführl. Gramm. § 1–8) and still more thoroughly by Buttmann (ausführl. griech. Sprachlehre, S. 1–8), and also, though not with complete accuracy, by Planck l. c. p. 13–23. Cf. besides, Tittmann, Synon. I. p. 262 sq., and Bernhardy, S. 28 ff.

The Jews in Egypt and Syria[2] — and to these we confine our remarks — learned Greek principally from oral intercourse with Greeks, and not from books.[3] It is not surprising, then, that even in writing they retained,

[1] *Sturz*, de dial. maced. et alex. p. 26 sqq. Yet the subject requires a new and thorough investigation; decisions such as that in *Thiersch* de Pentat. LXX. p. 74, can by no means settle the question.

[2] A precise distinction cannot be drawn between what belonged to the language of Alexandria, and what was peculiar to the variety of Greek used in Syria (and Palestine); and even if it could, it would be of little importance as respects the N. T. *Eichhorn's* attempt (Einl. ins N. T. IV. 124 ff.) is a failure, and could not be otherwise, as it was conducted with little judgment. Εὐχαριστεῖν, used by Demosthenes even, and from the time of Polybius by many writers, he pronounces an *addition* to the Alexandrian diction! ξενίζειν *hospitio excipere*, which is found not only in Xenophon but even in Homer, is labelled as an Alexandrian word! To what extent Greek was spoken by the Jews of Syria (and Palestine) we need not here inquire; on this point see *Paulus*, de Jud. Palaest. Jesu et apostolor. tempore non aram. dialecto sed graeca quoque locutis. Jen. 1803. II. 4; *Hug*, Einleitung, II. 31 ff.; my Realwörterb. II. 502.; *Schleiermacher*, Hermeneutik, S. 61 f.

[3] That the style of the Greek-speaking Jews was affected by the perusal of the Septuagint makes no essential difference here, where we have in view mainly the classic

for the most part, the peculiarities of the popular spoken language. This 34
was the case with the LXX., the writers of the N. T., and the authors of
many (the Palestin.) Apocrypha. Only a few learned Jews, who prized 21
and studied Grecian literature, such as Philo and Josephus,[1] attained a 7th ed.
style approximating to *literary* Greek. Though that popular variety of
Greek is no longer perfectly known,[2] yet, from a comparison of the Hel-
lenistic language (Hebraisms excepted) with the later literary prose, it
appears that, departing still more noticeably from classic elegance, it had 20
adopted in greater abundance new and provincial words and forms, and 6th ed.
begun to neglect more decidedly nice distinctions of construction and idiom,
to violate grammatical proprieties (their origin and grounds being lost
sight of), and to extend many corruptions already manifesting themselves
in the literary diction. Its main characteristic, however, continued to be
such an intermixing of the previously distinct dialects (Lobeck, Pathol.
p. 9.), that each province retained its own local variety as the basis of the
provincial style; — the Alexandrian retaining a predominance of Atticisms
and Doricisms.

We shall now endeavor to portray more minutely the later elements, both lexical and grammatical — of which the former are the more obvious — of the Hellenistic Greek which took its rise from the dialect spoken in Egypt, particularly in Alexandria (*dialectus Alexandrina*).[3] In doing

Greek element. Moreover, that no profound Greek scholarship can be ascribed even to the Apostle Paul (see, among others, *Pfochen*, p. 178) is now generally admitted. He undoubtedly possessed a greater mastery of Greek than such of the sacred writers as were natives of Palestine. This, however, he might easily attain in Asia Minor, and by his considerable intercourse with native Greeks, some of whom were persons of learning and distinction. *Köster*, in the Stud. und Krit. 1854. 2 (ob P. seine Sprache an der des Demosth. gebildet habe) brings together Demosthenic words and phrases, of nearly all of which it must be said that either Paul might have learned them from the spoken language of the educated, or that they are unlike the diction of the Attic orator. Copious command of Greek in the case of men who associated so much with Greeks does not suffice to prove them students of Greek literature.

[1] A comparison of portions of the earlier books of the Antiquities with the corresponding portions of the Septuagint, proves particularly that the style of Josephus is not to be put on a level with that of the Septuagint, or even of the N. T., and renders obvious the difference between a Jewish and a Greek narrative style. Cf. besides, *Schleiermacher*, Herm. S. 63.

[2] Hence a "complete view of the language of common life," which *Schleiermacher*, Herm. S. 59, would fain see, can never be given.

[3] On this (περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξανδρέων διαλέκτου) the grammarians *Irenaeus* (Pacatus) and *Demetrius Ixion* had written special works, which are now lost. See *Sturz*, dial. maced. et alex. p. 24, not. 4, cf. p. 19 sq. As extant specimens of this dialect, besides the well-known Rosetta inscription, are to be considered: Papyri graeci reg. Taurin. musei aegyptii ed. et illustr. a *A. Peyron*. Turin, 1827. 2 Vol. 4to., and the same author's Illustrazione di due papiri graeco-egizi dell' imper. museo di Vienna, in the Memorie dell' academ. di Torino, Tom. 33, p. 151 sqq. of the histor. class; Description of the Greek Papyri in the British Museum, Lond. 1839. 4to. Tom. 1; *J. A. Letronne*, Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Egypte, etc. Paris, 1842 and 1848, 2 Tom. 4to.

this, we shall constantly avail ourselves of the researches of Sturz, Planck,
35 Lobeck,[1] Boissonade, and others. For the passages they quote in proof (chiefly from the writers of the κοινή, Polybius, Plutarch, Strabo, Ælian, Artemidorus, Appian, Heliodorus, Sext. Empiricus, Arrian, etc.)[2] the reader must be referred to the works of these critics themselves. What appears to have belonged exclusively to the popular spoken language, and
22 is not to be found in any profane Greek author, we shall mark with an
7th ed. asterisk.[3]

21 1. Lexical Peculiarities: a. The later dialect comprised words
6th ed. and forms from all the Greek dialects, without distinction; as, for instance, *from the Attic:* ἅλως (Lob. 309), ὁ σκότος, ἀετός (Herm. Praef. ad Soph. Ai. p. 19), φιάλη, ἀλήθειν (Lob. 151), πρύμνα (Lob. 331), ἵλεως; *from the Doric:* πιάζω (πιέζω), κλίβανος (Lob. 179), ἡ λιμός, ποία (*grass*, instead of ποίη or πόα), βεμβράνας, which Zonaras quotes from 2 Tim. iv. 13, where however all our Codd. give μεμβρ., see Sturz, Zonarae glossae sacrae. Grimmae, 1820. 4to. P. II. p. 16; *from the Ionic:* γογγύζω (Lob. 358), ῥήσσω, πρηνής (yet already used in Aristot., see Lob. 431), βαθμός (Lob. 324), σκορπίζειν (Lob. 218), ἄρσην (Bttm. I. S. 84, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 78). *Ionic* and *Doric* is (εἰλίσσειν Rev. vi. 14 var.; cf. Mtth. I. 69) φύω in an intransitive sense (Heb. xii. 15, cf. Babr. 64.). Grammarians note as *Macedonic*, παρεμβολή *camp* (Lob. 377, cf. Schwarz, Soloec. ap. 66), ῥύμη *street;* as of *Cyrenaic* origin, βουνός *hill* (Lob. 355 sqq.); as *Syracusan*, the imperative εἰπόν (Fritzsche, ad Mr. p. 515).

b. The later dialect attached new significations to words already existing in the ancient language: παρακαλεῖν and ἐρωτᾶν* *entreat*, παιδεύειν *chastise*,

[1] Yet see even *Olear.* de stylo, p. 279 sqq.

[2] In studying the peculiarities of later Greek, the church Fathers and the books of Graeco-Roman law have hitherto been turned to scarcely any account. To the latter frequent reference will be made in the course of this treatise. How far the N. T. diction, through the influence of the church, affected the later Byzantine Greek, is reserved for separate inquiry. The Pseudepigrapha of the O. T. and the Apocrypha of the N. T., that is certain portions of them, are now available more completely, and in a better text; the latter through the labors of *Tdf.* The style of these clumsy compositions, though not by any means uniform, is on the whole so poor that the N. T. diction seems like classic Greek in comparison. Cf. besides, *Tdf.* de evangel. apocryph. origine et usu, in the Verhandelingen uitgeven door het Haagsche Genootschap, etc. 12 Thl. 1851. 8vo.

[3] The Greek grammarians, particularly Thomas Mag. (the latest edition by *Ritschl*, Halle, 1832. 8vo.), specify as common Greek much that is not unknown even to standard Attic (see e.g. θεμέλιος, Th. M. p. 437, and ἐρευνῶμαι, p. 363), and even fall sometimes into gross mistakes. Cf. *Oudendorp*, ad Thom. M. p. 903. Much that, *after* Alexander the Great, forced its way into the written language, undoubtedly was current before in the popular speech (as, perhaps, στρηνιᾶν, which first appears in the poets of the New Comedy). Besides, the N. T. writers frequently employ forms and words preferred by the Atticists, instead of those characterized as common Greek; e.g. χρηστότης, Thom M. p. 921, ἡ (not ὁ) λαῖλαψ, Thom. M. 864.

εὐχαριστεῖν *thank* (Lob. 18), ἀνακλίνειν, ἀναπίπτειν, ἀνακεῖσθαι, *to recline at table* (Lob. 216), ἀποκριθῆναι *answer* (Lob. 108), ἀντιλέγειν *oppose*, ἀποτάσσεσθαι *valere jubere, renuntiare* (Lob. 23 sq.), συγκρίνειν *compare* (Lob. 278), δαίμων, δαιμόνιον, *evil spirit*,[1] ξύλον (*living*) *tree* (Passow, sub verb.), διαπονεῖσθαι *aegre ferre**, στέγειν *hold off, endure*, σεβάζεσθαι *revere* (equivalent to σέβεσθαι, Fr. Rom. I. 74), συνίστημι *prove, establish* (Fr. Rom. I. 159), χρηματίζειν *be called* (Fr. Rom. II. 9), φθάνειν *come, arrive* (Fr. Rom. II. 356 sq.), κεφαλίς *volume* (*roll*) *of a book* (Bleek on Heb. x. 7), εὐσχήμων *a respectable, prominent, man* (Lob. 333), ψωμίζειν and χορτάζειν (fodder) *feed, nourish**,[2] ὀψώνιον *wages* (Sturz, 187), ὀψάριον *fish*, ἐρεύγεσθαι *eloqui* (Lob. 63 sq.), ἐπιστέλλειν *write a letter* (ἐπιστολή), περισπᾶσθαι *negotiis distrahi* (Lob. 415), πτῶμα *corpse* (Lob. 375), γεννήματα *fruges* (Lob. 286), σχολή *school* (Lob. 401), θυρεός *large* (*door-shaped*) *shield* (Lob. 366), δῶμα *house-top*, λοιβή *offering* (Babr. 23, 5), ῥύμη *street* (Lob. 404 sq.), παῤῥησία *assurance, confidence*, λαλιά *speech* (*dialect*), λαμπάς *lamp*, καταστολή *long robe**, νυνί *now* (in Attic, *this instant*) Fr. Rom. I. 182, στάμνος, which in the classics denotes a vessel for holding liquids, was used to signify also a vessel for dry articles, Babr. 108, 18. 36 23 7th ed. 22 6th ed.

A special peculiarity was to give neuter verbs the transitive or causative signification;[3] as, μαθητεύειν (Matt. xxviii. 19), θριαμβεύειν (2 Cor. ii. 14? yet see Mey.), in the Sept. even ζῆν, βασιλεύειν, and many others; cf. especially, Psalm xli. 3; cxviii. 50; cxxxviii. 7, etc., cf. § 32, 1. see Lydius de re mil. 6. 3, esp. Lob. Soph. Ai. p. 382 sqq. Lastly, in the case of μέθυσος, usage at least so far changed that the word, previously confined to females, was applied to both sexes (Lob. 151 sq.; Schäfer, ind. ad Æsop. p. 144).

c. Words and forms which in classical Greek were seldom used, or only by poets and in the more elevated kinds of style, became ordinary and favorite, and were employed even in common prose; such as, αὐθεντεῖν *to lord it* (Lob. 120), μεσονύκτιον (Thom. M. 609; Lob. 53), ἀλάλητος (?), θεοστυγής (Pollux 1, 21), ἔσθησις (Th. M. 370), ἀλέκτωρ (ἀλεκτρυών, Lob. 229), βρέχειν *irrigare* (Lob. 291), ἔσθω (for ἐσθίω) Bttm. II. 185. To

[1] That is, as its inherent signification; for, from the context, the word means this in the Iliad, 8, 166, as also in Dinarch. adv. Demosthen. § 30, p. 155, Bekk., a passage quoted by recent scholars. Even the Byzantines for precision add κακός to δαίμων, Agath. 114, 4.

[2] This extended meaning might be considered also as a Hebraism; ψωμίζειν was commonly used as quite equivalent to חָאַכְרִיל (cf. *Grimm* on Wisd. xvi. 20), like χορτάζειν, which in Greek authors is not applied to persons. (In opposition to *Pfochen*, see *Solanus* in *Rhenferd*, p. 297.) It is uncertain whether δεκαδύο for δώδεκα belongs to the later popular Greek, or was first formed by the LXX. The first seems to me the more probable, for to שְׁתֵּים עֶשְׂרֵה δώδεκα corresponds more exactly than δεκαδύο.

[3] Transitive verbs are more convenient in construction than intransitive. Later Greek even employed the construction προστάττειν τινά (Acta apocr. p. 172); just as in German *etwas widersprechen* is the more familiar phrase; in the language of trade we hear, das Rüböl *ist gefragt*.

the same head Eichhorn (Einl. ins N. T. IV. 127) refers the phrase *θέσθαι τι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, employed it is said in solemn style by the poets particularly the tragedians, since it occurs in the N. T. in the plainest prose. But the
37 Homeric phrase *ἐν φρεσὶ θέσθαι* is only similar, not identical. The expression *συντηρεῖν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*, cited by the same author as a solemn formula, is used also in the N. T. as emphatic. *Κοράσιον*, on the other hand, is to be regarded as an example of a word which, dropping its secondary import, was adopted into the literary style from the colloquial (Lob. 74), cf. Germ. *mädel*.

d. Many words which had long been in use received another form or pronunciation, which generally supplanted its predecessor; such as, *μετοικεσία* (*μετοικία*), *ἱκεσία* (*ἱκετεία*, Lob. 504), *ἀνάθεμα* (*ἀνάθημα*, Schäf. Plutarch. V. p. 11), *ἀνάστεμα*, *γενέσια* (*γενέθλια*, Lob. 104), *γλωσσόκομον* (*γλωσσοκομεῖον*, Lob. 98 sq.), *ἔκπαλαι* (*πάλαι*, Lob. 45 sq.), *ἐχθές* (*χθές*), *ἐξάπινα*
24 (*ἐξαπίνης*), *αἴτημα* (*αἴτησις*), *ψεῦσμα* (*ψεῦδος*, Sallier ad Th. M. 927), *ἀπάν-*
7th ed. *τησις* (*ἀπάντημα*), *ἥγησις* (*ἡγεμονία*), *λυχνία* (*λυχνίον*, Lob. 314), *νῖκος* (*νίκη*, Lob. 647), *οἰκοδομή* (*οἰκοδόμησις*, Lob. 490), *ὀνειδισμός*, Lob. 512 (*ὄνειδος*, *ὀνείδισμα*, Her. 2, 133), *ὀπτασία* (*ὄψις*), *ἡ ὁρκωμοσία* (*τὰ ὁρκωμόσια*), *μισθαποδοσία* (*μισθοδοσία*), *συγκυρία* (*συγκύρησις*), *ἀποστασία* (*ἀπόστασις*, Lob. 528), *νουθεσία* (*νουθέτησις*, Lob. 512), *ἀπαρτισμός* (*ἀπάρτισις*), *μελίσσιος* (*μελίσσειος*), *ποταπός* (*ποδαπός*, Lob. 56), *βασίλισσα* (*βασίλεια*),[1] *μοιχαλίς* (*μοιχάς* Lob. 452), *μονόφθαλμος* (*ἑτερόφθαλμος*, Lob. 136), *καμμύειν* (*καταμύειν*, Sturz, p. 123), *ὄψιμος* (*ὄψιος*, Lob. 52), *ὁ πλησίον* (*ὁ πέλας*), *προσήλυτος* (*ἔπηλυς*, Valcken. ad Ammon. p. 32), *φυσιοῦσθαι* (*φυσᾶν*) *to be puffed up* (trop. Babr. 114), *ἀτενίζειν* since Polybius for *ἀτενίζεσθαι* (Passow), *ἐκχύνειν*
23 (*ἐκχέειν*, Lob. 726), *στήκω* (from *ἕστηκα stand*, Bttm. II. 36), *ἀργός*, *ἡ*, *όν*
6th ed. (as an adject. of three terminations, Lob. 105), *πειθός*, *νοσσοί*, *νοσσιά* (*νεοσσοί*, *νεοσσιά*, Thom. M. 626; Lob. 206 f.), *πετάομαι* (*πέτομαι*, Lob. 581), *ἀπελπίζειν* (*ἀπογινώσκειν*), *ἐξυπνίζειν* (*ἀφυπνίζειν*, Lob. 224), *ῥαντίζειν* (*ῥαίνειν*), *δεκατοῦν* (*δεκατεύειν*), *ἀροτριᾶν* (*ἀροῦν*, Lob. 254 sq.), *βιβλαρίδιον** (*βιβλίδιον*, *βιβλιδάριον*), *ψιχίον* (*ψίξ*), *ταμεῖον* (*ταμιεῖον*) Lob. 493, *καταποντίζειν* (*καταποντοῦν*, Lob. 361), *παραφρονία* (*παραφροσύνη*)*, *πτύον* (*πτέον*, Lob. 321), *ψιθυριστής* (for *ψιθυρός*) Thom. M. 927, *ὠτάριον* (as most of the diminutives in *-αριον*, e.g. *παιδάριον*, *ὀνάριον*, Fr. Mr. p. 638). Purely Alexandrian (LXX.) are *ἀκρόβυστος* and *ἀκροβυστία*, Fr. Rom. I. 136; verbal forms in ω pure, instead of in *μι*, e.g. *ὀμνύω* for *ὄμνυμι*, Thom. M. 648. Cf. also *ξυράω* for *ξυρέω*, Thom. M. 642; Phot. Lex. 313 (Lob. 205, and ad Soph. Aiac. p. 181), pres. *βαρέω* (*βαρύνω*) Thom. M. p. 142, *σαροῦν* for *σαίρειν* Lob. 83, *χολᾶν* (*χολοῦσθαι*), *ἐξὸν εἶναι* for *ἐξεῖναι* (Foertsch, de locis Lysiae, p. 60 sq.). Active forms were adopted instead of the middle or deponent verbs usual in the earlier language; as, *φρυάσσειν* Act. iv. 25, from Ps. ii., *ἀγαλλιᾶν* Luke i. 47, *εὐαγγελίζειν* Lob. 269. Compound verbs, in which

[1] Similar to which is *ἱέρισσα* from *ἱερεύς*, which is found in Papyr. Taurin. 9, 14. Cf. *Sturz*, p. 173.

the preposition did not add to the meaning, were preferred to the less imposing and less sonorous simple forms.[1] Further, as even many compound verbs did not seem expressive enough, numerous double compounds made their appearance (Siebelis, Pr. de verb. compos. quae quatuor partibus 38
constant. Budiss. 1832. 4to.). For members of the human body, however, forms originally diminutive became sometimes the current forms in colloquial speech; as, *ὠτίον*, cf. Fischer, proluss. p. 10 sqq.; Lob. 211 sq., *φορτίον*.[2] Lastly, many substantives received a different gender and in 25
part a corresponding change of termination; see § 8 note, and § 9 note 2. 7th ed.

e. Entirely new words and phrases[3] were constructed, mainly by composition and for the most part to meet some sensible want; as, *ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος**, *ἀνθρωπάρεσκος* (Lob. 621), *ὁλόκληρος*, *ἀγενεαλόγητος**, *αἱματεκχυσία**, *δικαιοκρισία*, *σιτομέτριον*, *νυχθήμερον* (Sturz, 186), *πληροφορία* (Theophan. 132), *καλοποιεῖν* (Lob. 199 sqq.), *αἰχμαλωτίζειν* and *αἰχμαλωτεύειν* (for *αἰχμάλωτον ποιεῖν*, Thom. M. p. 23; Lob. 442), *μεσιτεύειν*, *γυμνητεύειν*, *ἀγαθοποιεῖν* (*ἀγαθοεργεῖν*) for *ἀγαθὸν ποιεῖν* (Lob. 290), *ἀγαλλίασις*, *ὁροθεσία*, 24
*ἀντίλυτρον**, *ἐκμυκτηρίζειν**, *ἀλεκτοροφωνία* (Lob. 229), *ἀποκεφαλίζειν* (Lob. 6th ed.
341), *ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι* (Æsop. 172 de Fur.), *ἐξουθενεῖν* (Lob. 182; Schäf. ind. Æsop. p. 135), *ἐκκακεῖν** (the literary Greek knows only *ἐγκακεῖν*, see my Comment. ad Gal. p. 134, and Mey. on 2 Cor. iv. 1), *εὐδοκεῖν* (Sturz, p. 168; Fr. Rom. II. 370 sq.), *ὁμοιάζειν**, *ἀγαθουργεῖν*, *ἀγαθωσύνη*, *διασκορπίζειν* (Lob. 218), *στρηνιᾶν* (*τρυφᾶν*, Lob. 381), *ἐγκρατεύομαι** (Lob. 442), *οἰκοδεσπότης*, *οἰκοδεσποτεῖν* (Lob. 373), *λιθοβολεῖν*, *προσφάγιον* (*ὄψον*, Sturz, 191), *λογία*, *κράββατος* (*σκίμπους*, Lob. 63; Sturz, 175 sq.), *πεποίθησις* (Lob. 295), *σπῖλος* (*κηλίς*, Lob. 28), *μάμμη* (*τήθη*, Lob. 133 sq.), *ῥαφίς* (*βελόνη*, Lob. 90), *ἀγριέλαιος* (*κότινος*, Moeris, p. 68), *ἀγνότης**, *ἁγιότης**, *ἐπενδύτης*, *ἐκτενῶς* and *ἐκτένεια* (Lob. 311), *ἀπαράβατος* (Lob. 313).

It belongs alike to d. and e. to remark that the later Greek especially abounded: — in substantives in *μα*, e.g. *κατάλυμα*, *ἀνταπόδομα*, *κατόρθωμα*, *ῥάπισμα*, *γέννημα*, *ἔκτρωμα* (Lob. 209), *βάπτισμα**, *ἔνταλμα*, *ἱεροσύλημα** (see Pasor, Gramm. N.T. pp. 571–574); — in substantives compounded with *συν*, e.g. *συμμαθητής*, *συμπολίτης* (Lob. 471); — in adjectives in *ινος*, e.g. *ὀρθρινός*

[1] That, on the other hand, simple verbs were in later Greek preferred to the corresponding compound, *Tdf.* (Stud. und Krit. 1842. S. 505) tries to prove from the expression *βουλὴν τιθέναι*, for which the earlier Greeks had used *βουλὴν προτιθέναι*. But these phrases may have differed in meaning, see *Raphel* on Acts xxvii. 12. With greater probability might be adduced here the verbs (mentioned under e.) *δειγματίζειν* and *θεατρίζειν*, for which in the written language we find only *παραδειγματίζειν* and *ἐκθεατρίζειν*; so also *ταρταροῦν* for *καταταρταροῦν*. In the same way the Prussian official style employs *Führung* for *Aufführung*.

[2] It may be mentioned here also, that abbreviated forms of proper names, which probably were current earlier in popular speech, made their way into the written language; as, *Ἀλεξᾶς*, *Σπανία* (for *Ἱσπανία*), etc. The derivatives of *δέχεσθαι* were but slightly altered; as, *πανδοχεύς*, *ξενοδοχεύς*, for *πανδοκεύς*, etc., *Lob.* 307.

[3] Many such words have been collected from the Fathers by *Suicer* in his sacrae observatt. (Tigur. 1665, 4to.) p. 311 sqq.

(Sturz, p. 186), πρωϊνός, καθημερινός, ὀστράκινος, δερμάτινος (Lob. 51 sq.), — in verbs in οω, ιζω, αζω, e.g. ἀνακαινόω, δυναμόω, ἀφυπνόω, δολιόω, ἐξουδενόω*, σθενόω, ὀρθρίζω*, δειγματίζω*, θεατρίζω, φυλακίζω*, ἱματίζω, ἀκουτίζω, πελεκίζω
39 (Lob. 341), αἱρετίζω (Babr. f. 61; Boisson. anecd. II. 318), σινιάζω. To these may be added also the presents formed from preterites στήκω (see above), γρηγορῶ Lob. 118 sq. Cf. also such adverbs as πάντοτε (διαπαντός, ἑκάστοτε), παιδιόθεν (ἐκ παιδίου, Lob. 93), καθώς (Sturz, p. 74), πανοικί (πανοικία, πανοικησία, Lob. 515), see Sturz, 187 sq.[1] Ἐσχάτως ἔχειν is a
26 later phrase (for κακῶς, πονηρῶς ἔχειν) Lob. 389; and καλοποιεῖν (see above)
7th ed. was used for the more ancient phrase καλῶς ποιεῖν.

It cannot be denied that the preceding list contains many words formed, agreeably to the prevailing analogy of the time, by the Greek-speaking Jews, or even by the N. T. writers themselves (especially Paul, Luke, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Origen. orat. § 27); cf. particularly ὀρθρίζειν (הַשְׁכֵּם), λιθοβολεῖν, αἱματεκχυσία, σκληροκαρδία, σκληροτράχηλος, ἀγαθοεργεῖν, ὀρθοποδεῖν, ὀρθοτομεῖν, μοσχοποιεῖν, μεγαλωσύνη, ταπεινοφροσύνη, παραβάτης, πατριάρχης, ἀγενεαλόγητος, ὑποπόδιον (Sturz, 199),
25 χρυσοδακτύλιος. However, the circumstance that no traces of these words
6th ed. are to be found in the Greek writers still extant of the first centuries after Christ (but these have not yet been fully explored)[2] must not be regarded as altogether decisive. Many of the words in question may have been already current in the popular speech of the Greeks. But words denoting Jewish institutions, or heathenism as idolatry, originated of course among the Greek-speaking Jews themselves; such as, σκηνοπηγία, εἰδωλόθυτον, εἰδωλολατρεία. Lastly, many words assumed among the Jews a peculiar meaning resting on special Jewish modes of thought; as, ἐπιστρέφεσθαι, ἐπιστροφή, absolutely used, *to convert, conversion*, προσήλυτος, πεντεκοστή *Whitsuntide*, κόσμος (in a figurative sense), φυλακτήριον, ἐπιγαμβρεύειν of the levirate marriage. In reference to Christian apostolic words and forms (such as βάπτισμα) see § 3 end, p. 35.

2. Grammatical Peculiarities: These are confined mostly to *inflections of nouns and verbs*, which were either unknown in the earlier language, or not used in certain words, or at least foreign to the literary Attic: for in this respect also the intermixture of dialects previously distinct became manifest. Moreover, the use of the Dual became rare.

[1] Popular Greek naturally adopted single foreign words (appellatives), with slight alterations, from the languages in use in the different provinces along with the Greek. On this, however, we cannot dwell in an inquiry so general as the above. With regard to the Egyptian element in the Septuagint and elsewhere, see *Sturz*, dialect. Alex. p. 84 sqq. Also Latin and Persian words and expressions have been pointed out in the N. T.; cf. *Olear.* de stylo N. T. p. 366 sq. 368 sqq.; *Georgi*, Hierocrit. I. p. 247 sqq. and the whole of II. (de latinismis N. T.). Cf. *Dresig*, de N. T. gr. latinismis merito et falso suspectis. Lips. 1726, 4to., and *Schleiermacher*, Hermeneutik, S. 62 f.

[2] Most of this description appear subsequently in the Byzantine authors, who abound in double compounds and lengthened forms of words. What had fallen into disuse was eagerly restored and revived.

The later Greek has few *syntactical* peculiarities. Certain verbs, for instance, are construed with cases different from those they formerly used 40
to govern (§ 31, 1. cf. Boissonade, anecd. III. 136, 154); conjunctions which previously took only the Subjunct. or Optat. are used with the Indic.; the use of the Optat., particularly in the oratio obliqua, decreases sensibly; the use of the future participle after verbs of going, sending, etc., recedes before that of the present (or the infinitive); Active verbs with ἑαυτόν begin to be substituted for Middle, when unemphatic. Also, in general, more forcible expressions lose their emphasis. On the other hand, additional expressiveness is aimed at even by grammatical forms, cf. μειζότερος, ἵνα instead of the Infinitive, etc. But the later varieties of inflection will most appropriately find place in § 4.

Later popular Greek had, beyond doubt, different peculiarities in different provinces. Critics, accordingly, have professed to discover Cilicisms in the style of Paul (Hieron. ad Algasiam quaest. 10. Tom. IV. ed. Marti- 27
anay, p. 204). The four examples, however, which this Father adduces 7th ed.
are not conclusive (Michaelis, Einl. ins N. T. 1 Thl. S. 161); and as we know nothing respecting the provincialisms of Cilicia (see, however, Sturz, Dial. Alex. p. 62), it is better at present to dismiss the investigation altogether, than to rest it on empty conjectures. Cf. B. Stolberg, de Cilicismis a Paulo usurpatis, in his tr. de soloecismis N. T. p. 91 sqq.

§ 3. HEBREW-ARAMAIC TINGE OF THE N. T. DICTION. 26
6th ed.

This popular variety of Greek, however, was not spoken and written by the Jews without foreign admixture. They not only imparted to their Greek style the general complexion of their mother tongue, which consists in vividness and circumstantiality as well as uniformity of expression, but also introduced particular Jewish turns of expression. Yet both these peculiarities are more apparent in their translations directly from Hebrew, than in their original composition in Greek.[1]

Lexical Hebraisms (and Aramaisms) are more numerous than grammatical; and consist partly in the extension of the signification of words, partly in the imitation of entire phrases, and partly also in the analogous formation of new words to express corresponding Hebrew terms. Thus originated a Jewish-Greek, which native Greeks did not entirely understand,[2] and which they even 41
sometimes turned into ridicule.

[1] Herein lies an argument, which has received little attention, why the text of the N. T. is not to be regarded as a translation from the Aramaic, and that too, in a great measure, clumsily executed.

[2] Though the opinion of *L. de Dieu* (praefat. ad grammat. orient.): facilius Euro-

All the nations which after the death of Alexander continued under Graeco-Macedonian rule and which gradually adopted the Greek language of their conquerors even in common life, particularly the Syrians and Hebrews, spoke Greek less purely than native Greeks, and imparted to it more or less the impress of their mother tongue (Salmas. de lingua Hellen. p. 121, cf. Joseph. antt. 20, 9).[1] As the Greek-speaking Jews are
28 usually denominated Hellenists, this Oriental variety of Greek, known to
7th ed. us only in the writings of Jews, has not improperly obtained the name
27 of the Hellenistic idiom; see Buttm. I. S. 6.[2] Accordingly, the diction
6th ed. of the LXX. and of the N. T. (of the Pseudepigrapha of the O. T. and the Apocrypha of the N. T.) has been especially called Hellenistic; yet it was not Drusius (ad Act. vi. 6), but Scaliger (animad. in Euseb. p. 134), who first employed this term.

42 The Hebraisms of the N. T. — for these only, and not the oriental cast of the periods and arrangement of words, were usually attended to — have been collected frequently and thoroughly; in particular by Vorst, Leusden (in his Philol. hebr., from which the dissertatio de dialectis N. T. sing. de ejus hebraismis was separately printed by J. F. Fischer, Lips. 1754,

paeis foret Platonis Aristotelisque elegantiam imitari, quam Platoni Aristotelive N. T. nobis interpretari, is decidedly an exaggeration. Still, the circumstance mentioned above may in general explain the fact that learned Greek transcribers, or possessors of MSS. of the N. T., often took the liberty of making corrections in order to bring the diction nearer to Grecian elegance; see *Hug*, Einl. ins N. T. I. S. 129.

[1] It is well known that Greek subsequently became *Latinized*, also, when the Romans began to write in that language. The Latin coloring, however, is not very marked *before* the Byzantine literature, even in Greek translations from Latin authors, such as that of Eutropius by Pacanius, of Cicero's Cat. Maj. and Somn. Scip. by Theodorus (published by *Götz*. Nürnb. 1801. 8vo.). This was partly owing to the much closer affinity between Greek and Latin than between Hebrew and Greek, and partly because these authors had made Greek a special study.

[2] This appellation ought to be resumed as a technical term, it is so thoroughly appropriate. For ἑλληνιστής in the N. T. (Acts vi. 1) denotes a Greek-speaking Jew; (for compilations respecting ἑλληνίζειν rather than ἑλληνιστής, see *Wetstein* II. p. 490; *Lob.* p. 379 sq.). The notion of *Salmasius*, that in the N. T. *Hellenist* means a Greek proselyte to Judaism, is a rash conclusion from Acts vi. 5, and *Eichstädt* (ad *Mori* acroas. herm. I. p. 227) should not have adopted it. Moreover, the controversy between *Dn. Heinsius* (exercit. de lingua hellenist. L. B. 1643. 8vo.), and *Salmasius* (hellenistica L. B. 1643. 8vo.; funus linguae hellen. ib. 1643. 8vo.; ossilegium linguae hellen. ib. 1643. 8vo.), on the appellation *dialectus hellenistica*, related not merely to the word *Hellenistic*, but still more to the term *dialectus*, for which Salmasius wished to substitute *character* or *stylus idioticus* (de Hellenist. p. 250), compare also *Tittmann*, Synonym. I. p. 259 sq. Yet the term dialect (διάλεκτος τοπική) might be allowable to denote, particularly in accordance with the very extensive meaning of the verb διαλέγεσθαι (see, e.g. Strabo 8, 514), that variety of Greek spoken by Hellenistic Jews. Other dissertations on the designation dialect. hellenist. see in *Walch*, bib. theol. IV. p. 278 sq. and *Fabric.* biblioth. graec. ed. *Harles*. IV. p. 893 sq. *Thiersch* and *Rost* have begun to call the language of the Greek Bible the *ecclesiastical dialect*. This, however, is too narrow for the subject discussed above, and the word *dialect* is inappropriate.

1792, 8vo.), and Olearius (de Stylo N. T. p. 232 sqq.), cf. also Hartmann, linguist. Einl. in das Stud. d. A. T. S. 382 ff. Anm. Still, this matter ought to have been executed with more critical precision.[1] Nearly all who have written on this subject hitherto, are chargeable, more or less, with the following errors:

a. They did not give sufficient attention to the Aramaic elements in the diction of the N. T.[2] In the time of Christ, as all know, the popular speech 29
of the Jews in Palestine was not the old Hebrew, but Syro-Chaldaic; 7th ed.
accordingly, many of the most current expressions of common life[3] must have been introduced into Jewish-Greek from this dialect. Among the 28
older writers Olearius has a special section de Chaldaeo-Syriasmis N. T. 6th ed.
p. 345 sqq. (cf. Georgi, Hierocrit. I. p. 187 sqq.). More recently, a great deal relating to this subject has been collected by Boysen (krit. Erläuterungen des Grundtextes d. N. T. aus der syrischen Uebersetzung. Quedlinb. 1761, 8vo., 3 Stücke), Agrell (oratio de dictione N. T. Wexion. 1798, and otiola Syriaca. Lund. 1816, 4to. pp. 53–58), and Hartmann (as above, 382 ff.). Already had several earlier commentators occasionally directed attention to Aramaisms; see Michaelis, Einleit. ins N. T. 1 Thl. S. 138 ff.; Fischer ad Leusden, p. 140; Bertholdt's Einleit. 1 Thl. S. 158. — Under this head come also the (few) Rabbinisms (see Olear. l. c. p. 360 sqq.; Georgi l. c. p. 221 sqq.), for the elucidation of which much may still be derived from Schöttgen, Hor. Hebr. They are mostly terms that may have been used in the Rabbinical schools as early as the time of Christ.

b. They overlooked almost entirely the difference in style of the several writers; so that according to their collections all the books of the 43
N. T. appear to abound in Hebraisms to the same extent. But in this particular no little dissimilarity exists, and Matthew, Luke, John, Paul, James, and the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ought by no means to be thrown together promiscuously.[4] Those learned collectors failed also

[1] A new and complete treatise on the Hebraisms of the N. T., elaborated critically and on rational principles, is certainly needed. Meanwhile, the commencement recently made (*D. E. F. Böckel*, de hebraismis N. T. Spec. 1. Lips. 1840, 8vo.) deserves to be gratefully recognized.

[2] Many of the peculiarities pointed out by the Hebraists might with equal propriety be called either Hebraisms or Syriasms: e.g. εἷς for an indefinite article, and the frequent use of participles with εἶναι for a finite verb. It is preferable, however, to regard these and the like as Aramaisms, since they are far more common and more distinctly established in the Aramaic, and occur almost exclusively in those later Hebrew writings the style of which approaches the Aramaic. This refers principally to the diction of the N. T., for the Septuagint exhibits but few Aramaisms. Cf. *Olear.* p. 308; *Gesen.* Com. zu Jes. I. 63.

[3] To these the Aramaisms of the N. T. are, essentially, confined. For the religious expressions are to be connected (through the medium of the Sept. in the case of the majority of extra-Palestinean Jews) with the Ancient Hebrew, the sacred language. To the same class also belongs θάνατος, *pestilence*, Rev. vi. 8; xviii. 8 (מוֶתָא, ܡܘܬܐ); cf. *Ewald*, Com. in Apoc. p. 122.

[4] Even in one and the same writer we find a want of uniformity. Thus Luke in his

to show the relation between the diction of the N. T. and that of the Septuagint; though, great as the resemblance is, considerable dissimilarity exists, and, speaking generally, the style of the LXX. as a direct and in part a literal translation of the Hebrew text is more Hebraistic than that of the N. T.

c. They included in their list of Hebraisms many expressions which are not unknown to the Greek prose writers, or are the common property of many languages; and, in general, they were guided by no distinct notion
30 of what constitutes a Hebraism; see Tittmann, de causis contortar. inter-
7th ed. pretatt. N. T. p. 18 sq. (Synonym. I. p. 269 sqq.); de Wette in the A. L. Z. 1816. N. 39. S. 306.

They made a threefold use of the term Hebraism, viz. to designate

1. Such words, phrases, and constructions, as are peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) tongue, and to which there is nothing corresponding in Greek prose; e.g. *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι, ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι, πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν, οἰκοδομεῖν* (in a figurative sense), *πλατύνειν τὴν καρδίαν, πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω, οὐ ..... πᾶς* (for *οὐδείς*), *ἐξομολογεῖσθαί τινι* and *ἔν τινι*, etc.

2. Such words, etc. as, though occasionally occurring in Greek authors, are imitated by the writers of the N. T. directly from their native tongue; e.g. *σπέρμα* for *proles* (Schwarz, Comm. p. 1235) hebr. זֶרַע; *ἀνάγκη distress, calamity* (cf. D. Sic. 4, 43; Schwarz, as above, p. 81) hebr. מָצוֹק, מְצוּקָה, צָר, צָרָה; *ἐρωτᾶν request* (as שָׁאַל denotes both *request* and *interrogate*, cf.
29 9th ed. the Latin *rogare*) Babr. 97, 3; Apollon. synt. p. 289; *εἰς ἀπάντησιν* (D. Sic. 8, 59; Polyb. 5, 26, 8) cf. לִקְרַאת; *πέρατα τῆς γῆς* (Thuc. 1, 69; Xen. Ages. 9, 4; Dio Chr. 62. 587) cf. אַפְסֵי אָרֶץ; *χεῖλος* for *littus* (Her. 1, 191; Strabo, and others) cf. שָׂפָה; *στόμα* of a *sword* (פֶּה) cf., besides the Poets, Philostrat. her. 19, 4. So also the expression *ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν* (*Ταρκύνιον ἐνδύσ.* in Dion. H.), formed after לָבַשׁ צֶדֶק, etc. Cf. above, p. 17.

3. Such words, etc., as are equally common in Greek and in Hebrew, and with regard to which, accordingly, there is room for doubt whether they are to be considered as portions of the popular Greek adopted by the Jews, or as currently employed by them through the influence of their
44 native tongue; e.g. *φυλάσσειν νόμον, αἷμα caedes, ἀνήρ* joined to an appellative (*ἀνὴρ φονεύς*), *παῖς slave, μεγαλύνειν to praise, διώκειν to pursue*, (*cultivate*) a virtue. To this head may be referred many of the grammatical illustrations contained in Haab's grammar.

4. Lastly, it cannot be denied that in a great many passages expositors introduced imaginary Hebraisms (Aramaisms); as, Eph. v. 26, *ἐν ῥήματι ἵνα* עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר (see Koppe); Matt. xxv. 23, *χαρά convivium* from Aram.

Gospel, where he had to follow the evangelical *paradosis*, hebraizes more than in the Acts; the deterioration in the diction after the proem of the Gospel was long ago pointed out. The hymns, also, and the speeches, have more of a Hebrew coloring than the narative part; cf. e.g. Luke i. 13–20, 42–55, 68–79. The linguistic relation of Luke to the Synoptics has not yet been systematically exhibited.

הֲדָוָה (see Fischer, ad Leusden dial. p. 52) or Hebr. שִׁמְחָה, Esth. ix. 17, etc. (Eichhorn, Einl. ins N. T. I. 528); Matt. vi. 1, δικαιοσύνη *alms* from Chald. צְדָקָה; Matt. xxi. 13, λῃσταί *traders* (Fischer, ad Leusden dial. p. 48); and during the process many a misuse of the Sept. crept in (as Luke xi. 22, σκῦλα *supellex*, cf. Esth. iii. 13; Acts ii. 24, ὠδῖνες *vincula*, cf. Ps. xviii. 6). And to crown all, πέραν *on this side*, like עֵבֶר (?)! Cf. also Fr. Rom. I. 367.[1]

It is obvious from what has been said that there are two kinds of Hebraisms in the N. T., one of which may be called *perfect*, and the other *imperfect*. By *perfect* Hebraisms we mean those words, phrases, and constructions which are strictly peculiar to the Hebrew (Aramaean) language, and therefore were transferred directly thence into the Hellenistic idiom, (the diction of the N. T.).[2] On the other hand, we call *imperfect* Hebraisms 21
all words, phrases, and constructions which, though to be found also in 7th ed.
Greek prose authors, are in all probability introduced directly from the Hebrew (Aramaean): first, because the N. T. writers were more familiar with Aramaean than with Greek; and secondly, because the phraseology in question was of more frequent occurrence in the former language than in the latter. De Wette also perceived this distinction, and stated it as follows (as above, S. 319): "Certainly it makes an essential difference whether a form of speech is wholly foreign to the Greek, or, on the other hand, finds in Greek a point of contact to which it can attach itself."

This whole investigation must be carried farther back; and first of all the *origin* of the so-called Hebraisms must be considered. In doing this, however, we cannot take the LXX.[3] as our basis, since they, as translators, 30
furnish no sure testimony respecting that Greek diction of the Jews which 6th ed.
was formed *independently* and by oral intercourse. Nor can we immediately use for this purpose the doctrinal parts of the N. T., as the *religious* phraseology of the Jews in Greek was naturally a close imitation of the Hebrew, and formed on the model of the Septuagint. But it is preeminently from the narrative style of the Apocrypha, the Gospels, and the Acts, that the influence of Hebrew on the Greek of Jews is to be most clearly determined.

In the first place, it is plain that original writers, scarcely less than 45
translators, unconsciously gave their Greek style the *general* impress of the Hebrew-Aramaic idiom, from the influence of which, as their mother

[1] In the title of *Kaiser's* dissertation de linguae aramaicae usu cet. Norimb. 1831. 8vo. the word *abusu* would be nearer the truth.

[2] *Blessig's* definition is: Hebraismus est solius hebraei sermonis propria loquendi ratio, cujusmodi in graecam vel aliam linguam sine barbarismi suspicione transferre non licet.

[3] The most important work that has yet appeared on the linguistic element of the Septuagint, is *H. W. Jos. Thiersch*, de Pentateuchi versione alex. libb. 3. Erlang. 1840. 8vo., from which I have obtained many acceptable illustrations for the later editions of this Grammar. But a complete exhibition of the diction of the Septuagint is very much needed.

tongue, they could not rid themselves without great attention and long practice. This *general* impress consists, partly in explicitness (hence the use of prepositions with cases instead of cases alone, the latter construction implying more abstraction), and a predilection for circumstantiality (φεύγειν ἀπὸ προσώπου τινός, ἐγράφη διὰ χειρός τ., πάντες ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου, καὶ ἔσται — καὶ ἐκχεῶ, and the like; the frequent use of the pers. and dem. pron. particularly after the relative, the narrative expression καὶ ἐγένετο, etc.); partly in the simplicity, and even monotony, with which the Hebrew (agreeably to a co-ordinating, rather than subordinating principle) constructs periods, and links clause to clause. Hence the sparing use of conjunctions in Jewish-Greek (in which respect the classic authors display so copious a variety); hence the uniformity in the use of the tenses;
32 hence the absence of periodic combination of several subordinate clauses
7th ed. into a single sentence, and, in connection with this, the scanty use of participial constructions, so frequent and so diversified among the Greeks.

In narration, a further prominent peculiarity of Hebrew-Greek consists in this, that the words of another are almost always quoted directly; whereas the indirect introduction of quotations gives a distinctive cast to the Greek historical style, and occasions particularly the diversified use of the Optative, a mood almost unknown in the Greek writings of Jews.

From this *general* Jewish influence alone the Greek of the Jews must have received a strongly marked character; but in *particulars* it received a great additional influence, and it is these particulars which are usually styled Hebraisms.

a. Attaching the derivative meanings of a vernacular word to that foreign word which corresponds to it in primary signification was the simplest mode of Hebraizing (cf. ἐρωτᾶν שָׁאַל *to interrogate* and *to request*). Hence it would not be strange if the Jews had used δικαιοσύνη for *alms*, according to the use of צדקה. Less dubious instances are ὀφείλημα *pec-*
31 *catum*, after the Aram. חוֹב; νύμφη (*bride*) also *daughter-in-law* Matt. x. 35,
6th ed. as כַּלָּה denotes both (Sept. Gen. xxxviii. 11); εἷς for *primus* (in certain cases) like אֶחָד; ἐξομολογεῖσθαί τινι also *praise one* (thanking), like הוֹדָה לְ (Ps. cvi. 47; cxxii. 4, and elsewhere in Sept.); εὐλογεῖν *bless*, i.e. make happy, like בֵּרֵךְ; κτίσις thing *created*, *creation*, cf. Chald. בְּרִיָה; δόξα *brightness*, like כָּבוֹד; δυνάμεις *miracles*, גְּבוּרוֹת. The transfer of figurative senses is the most frequent; as, ποτήριον *sors*, *portio* Matt. xx. 22 (כּוֹס); σκάνδαλον *stumbling-block* in a moral sense (מִכְשׁוֹל); γλῶσσα for *nation* (לָשׁוֹן); χεῖλος for *speech* (שָׂפָה); ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (לִפְנֵי יְהוָה) *according to God's judgment;*
46 καρδία εὐθεῖα (יָשָׁר); περιπατεῖν *walk*, of one's course of life; ὁδός (דֶּרֶךְ) cf. Schäf. ind. ad Aesop. p. 148; ἀνάθεμα not merely what is consecrated to God, but, agreeably to the Heb. חֵרֶם, *to be destroyed*, Rom. ix. 3, Deut. vii. 26, Josh. vi. 17, and elsewhere; λύειν Matt. xvi. 19 for *declare lawful*, after the Rabbin. הִתִּיר.

b. Numerous Hebraisms arose from the verbal translation of certain

very common vernacular expressions; as, *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν* for נָשָׂא פָּנִים; *ζητεῖν ψυχήν* for בִּקֵּשׁ נֶפֶשׁ; *ποιεῖν ἔλεος* (*χάριν*) *μετά τινος*, for עָשָׂה חֶסֶד עִם; *ἀνοίγειν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς* or *τὸ στόμα τινός* (פָּקַח); *γεύεσθαι θανάτου* טָעַם מִיתָא (Talm.); *ἄρτον φαγεῖν* (*coenare*) for אָכַל לֶחֶם; *αἷμα ἐκχέειν* (שֶׁפַךְ דָּם) *kill*; *ἀνίστημι σπέρμα τινί* for הֵקִים זֶרַע לְ; *υἱὸς θανάτου* for בֶּן־מָוֶת (*οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος*); *καρπὸς ὀσφύος* for פְּרִי חֲלָצַיִם; *καρπὸς κοιλίας* for פְּרִי בֶטֶן; *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος τινός* for יָצָא מֵחַלְצֵי פ׳; *ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός* for מִבֶּטֶן אִמּוֹ[1]; *ὀφείλημα ἀφιέναι* for שָׁבַק חוֹבָא (Talm.); also *στηρίζειν πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ* for חִשֵּׂם פָּנָיו; *πᾶσα σάρξ* for כָּל־בָּשָׂר. 33 7th ed.

c. The formation of foreign derivatives in imitation of vernacular, implies more reflection and contrivance; as, *ὁλοκαύτωμα* (from *ὁλοκαυτοῦν*, Lob. 524) for עֹלָה; *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* from *σπλάγχνα*, as רָחַם is connected with רַחֲמִים; *σκανδαλίζειν*, *σκανδαλίζεσθαι*, like הִכְשִׁיל, נִכְשַׁל; *ἐγκαινίζειν* from *ἐγκαίνια*, as חָנַךְ is related to חֲנֻכָּה; *ἀναθεματίζειν*, like הֶחֱרִים; *ὀρθρίζειν*, like הִשְׁכִּים; perhaps *ἐνωτίζεσθαι*, like הֶאֱזִין, cf. Fischer ad Leusden dial. p. 27. *Προσωπολημπτεῖν*, for which even the Hebr. has no single corresponding word, goes still further.

All this easily accounts for the predominant Hebrew-Aramaic complexion of the style of the N. T. writers, who were not, like Philo and Josephus,[2] acquainted with Greek literature, and did not aim at writing correct Greek. Hence, the whole cast of their composition (particularly the want of compactness, especially in narration) must have offended a cultivated Greek ear; indeed, numerous single expressions must either have conveyed to a native Greek an erroneous meaning, or have been entirely unintelligible (such as *ἀφιέναι ὀφειλήματα*,[3] *πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν*, *λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, and the like); cf. Gataker de Stylo N. T. cap. 5. Hence also is explained why such Hebraistic turns of expression are less frequent in the original authors of the N. T. than in the translators of the O. T., and in the *Hellenistic* writers of the N. T. (Paul, Luke, particularly in the 32 6th ed. 47

[1] A similar Grecism in Latin is e.g. *a teneris unguiculis* (Cic. fam. 1, 6, 3), which although a Greek phrase was quite intelligible to the Romans, as e.g. *καρπὸς χειλέων*, though it must have had a strange sound, was unquestionably intelligible to the Greeks; cf. *καρπὸς φρενῶν*, Pind. Nem. 10, 22. Still more easily must the Greeks have understood *καρπὸς κοιλίας*, since *fruit*, by itself, (for fruit of the body) was used in unambiguous connections, as well among the Greeks (Arist. polit. 7, 16; Eurip. Bacch. 1305), as elsewhere; cf. *Ruhnken*, ad Homer. in Cerer. 23.

[2] Though even Josephus, when narrating Old Test. history after the Septuagint, does not always avoid Hebraisms; see *Scharfenberg*, de Josephi et LXX. consensu, in *Pott's* sylloge, VII. p. 306 ff.

[3] That is, in the signification of remitting *sins*, so far, therefore, as regards *ὀφειλήματα*. For, *ἀφιέναι remit*, even applied to offences, occurs in Her. 6, 30, in the expression *ἀφιέναι αἰτίαν*, and *ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι debita* remittere (obligatory acts), is quite common. In later Greek we find *ἀφιέναι τινὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν*, Plutarch, Pomp. 34; see *Coraes* and *Schäf.* in loc. The well-known phrase *εὑρίσκειν χάριν* would likewise have been understood by a native Greek, though it would have sounded strange to him (instead of *εὑρίσκεσθαι*).

second part of the Acts, John, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews; cf. Tholuck, Com. Cap. I. § 2. S. 25 sqq.) than in those more strictly Palestinean (Matthew, Peter).[1] And it is obvious, further, that not all the Hebraisms in the diction of the apostles were adopted *unconsciously* (van d. Honert, Synt. p. 103). Religious expressions — and of these the main portion of N. T. Hebraisms consist — they must have been influenced to retain by the circumstance that in these expressions their religious ideas themselves were embodied, and because Christianity had to be built on a
34 Jewish foundation.[2] The existing Greek, too, possessed in fact no phrase-
7th ed. ology for the profound religious phaenomena which apostolic Christianity disclosed.[3] Still, it is an exaggeration to assert, with Eichhorn and Bretschneider (Prefat. ad Lexic. N. T. ed. 2. II. p. 12),[4] that the authors of the N. T. in composition did all their thinking in Hebrew or Aramaic. That is the process of a tyro. We moderns even, in writing Latin, after we have attained a certain proficiency, gradually (though never altogether) cease to think first in our vernacular. Men who, though not regularly
33 trained in the study of language, were constantly hearing Greek spoken
34th ed. and very frequently, yes ordinarily, speaking it themselves, must soon have acquired such a command of its words and phrases and such skill in expression, that in composition the Greek would present itself directly, and not solely through the medium of Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic words and phrases.[5] The comparison of the authors of the N. T. with modern beginners in writing Latin, or even with (uneducated) Jews speaking

[1] The Grecian training of individual writers appears particularly in the appropriate use of *verba composita* and *decomposita*.

[2] Cf. *Beza*, ad Act. x. 46. *Rambach* is not altogether wrong in saying (institutt. hermen. 1, 2, 2): lingua N. T. passim ad ebraei sermonis indolem conformata est, ut hoc modo concentus scripturae utriusque test. non in rebus solum sed ipsis etiam in verbis clarius observaretur. Cf. *Pfaff.* nott. ad Matt. p. 34; *Olear.* 341 sqq.; *Tittmann*, de dilig. gramm. p. 6 sq. (Synon. I. p. 201 sq.). Further cf. *J. W. Schröder*, de causis quare dictio pure graeca in N. T. plerumque praetermissa sit, Marb. 1768. 4to.; also *van Hengel*, com. in ep. ad Philipp. p. 19.

[3] Some good remarks on this point are to be found in *Hvalstroem*, spec. de usu graecitatis alex. in N. T. (Upsal. 1794. 4to.) p. 6 sq. *Van den Honert* went even so far as to assert: vel ipse Demosthenes, si eandem rem, quam nobis tradiderunt apostoli, debita perspicuitate et efficacia perscribere voluisset, hebraismorum usum evitare non potuisset.

[4] The latter, however, recalled this opinion, so far at least as regards Paul (Grundlage des evang. Pietism. u. s. w. S. 179).

[5] How easily do we, who never heard Latin spoken by a native Roman, attain the power of at once conceiving in Latin, dixit verum esse, or quam virtutem demonstravit aliis praestare, and the like, without first mentally construing dixit quod verum sit, or de qua virtute demonstravit, quod ea, etc. Thinking in conformity to the genius of one's mother tongue, appears particularly in phrases and figures which have become habitual, and which one introduces unconsciously in speaking or writing a foreign language. So it was with the apostles, who constantly employed, and with perfect propriety, along with many Hebraistic expressions, numerous Greek phrases entirely foreign to the genius of Hebrew.

German, is as incorrect as it is unworthy; cf. Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 54, 59, 257. Besides, it is forgotten that the apostles found a Jewish-Greek idiom already current, and therefore did not first frame for themselves most of their phraseology by thinking it out in Hebrew.

(Many Greek words are used by the N. T. writers with a specific reference to the Christian system (even in contrast with Judaism), so to 48
speak, like religious technical terms. Hence arises, apparently, a third element of N. T. diction, viz. the *distinctively Christian* (see Olear. de Stylo N. T. p. 380 sqq. ed. Schwarz; Eckard, technica sacra. Quedlinb. 1716. 4to.). Compare particularly the words ἔργα (ἐργάζεσθαι Rom iv. 4), πίστις, πιστεύειν εἰς Χριστόν or πιστεύειν absol., ὁμολογία, δικαιοσύνη and δικαιοῦσθαι, ἐκλέγεσθαι, οἱ κλητοί, οἱ ἐκλεκτοί, οἱ ἅγιοι (for *Christians*), οἱ πιστοί and οἱ ἄπιστοι, οἰκοδομή and οἰκοδομεῖν in the figurative sense, ἀπόστολος, εὐαγγελίζεσθαι and κηρύττειν absol. for Christian preaching, the appropriation of βάπτισμα for Christian baptism, perhaps κλᾶν ... τὸν ... ἄρτον 35
for the holy repasts (the *Agape* with the Communion), ὁ κόσμος, ἡ σάρξ, 7th ed.
ὁ σαρκικός, in the familiar theological sense, etc. Most of these expressions, however, already existed in the O. T. and in rabbinical writings.[1] Accordingly it will not be easy to prove any phraseology to be altogether peculiar to the apostles — to have been *introduced* by them. This apostolic element, therefore, is restricted rather to the *meaning* and application of words and phrases, and lies on the very outskirts of the province of *philological* inquiry. Cf., however, Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 56, 67 f. 138 f. [and G. v. Zezschwitz, Profangräcität u. biblisch. Sprachgeist. Eine Vorl. üb. die bibl. Umbildung hellenischer Begriffe, bes. der psychologischen. Leipz. 1859. 8vo.]. In the historical vocabulary πάσχειν *to suffer*, and παραδίδοσθαι *to be delivered up*, absol., had established themselves as technical expressions for the last earthly fate of Jesus.)

Grammatical Hebraisms will be discussed in the next section.

§ 4. GRAMMATICAL CHARACTER OF THE N. T. DICTION. 34
6th ed.

As respects the grammatical character of the N. T. diction, those same two elements above mentioned may be distinctly traced. That is to say, here also the peculiarities of the N. T. phraseology are, fundamentally, those of the later (common) Greek language, and consist more in certain forms of inflection than in syntactical combinations. With these are occasionally mingled (though far

[1] To attempt to explain such expressions in the Christian terminology of the apostles by quotations from Greek authors (cf. *Krebs*, observ. praef. p. 4) is extremely absurd. But, on the other hand, it is necessary to distinguish the diction of the apostles, far more tinged as it was with Old Testament peculiarities, from the terminology of the Greek Church, which was constantly growing more and more peculiar.

less copiously) Hebrew turns and constructions in the use of all the parts of speech. A predilection for prepositions where the Greeks employ cases alone is especially noticeable. In general the grammatical character of the N. T. idiom conforms to the laws of the Greek language; the authors of the N. T. have even adopted many constructions peculiarly Greek (attraction of the relative and the preposition), and have observed strictly, though as by mere instinct, numerous distinctions entirely foreign to Hebrew (e.g. that between the negatives *οὐ* and *μή*, etc.).

49 We find it true in Greek, as in almost all languages the history of whose growth can be traced, that changes produced by time are lexical in their nature far more than grammatical (compare, for instance, the German of Luther's translation of the Bible with that of the present day). For the
36 later common Greek exhibits but few grammatical peculiarities, and these
7th ed. almost all relate to inflections. We find, that is to say, first and foremost, a number of inflections in nouns and verbs which either were not used at all previously, and were first formed in later times by the abbreviation or the extension of the original forms, or which pertained exclusively to some one of the dialects. Of the latter sort are, for example, a. *Attic* inflections: *τιθέασι*, *ἠβουλήθην*, *ἤμελλε*, *βούλει* (*βούλῃ*), *ὄψει*; b. *Doric:* *ἡ λιμός* as fem., *ἦτω* (*ἔστω*), *ἀφέωνται* (*ἀφεῖνται*); c. *Æolic:* the Optat. in *ια* in 1st Aor. (yet this was early adopted into Attic); d. *Ionic:* *γήρει*, *σπείρης*, *εἶπα* (1st Aor.). As forms quite unknown in the earlier language must be mentioned, Datives like *νοΐ*, Imperat. *κάθου*, Perfects like *ἔγνωκαν* (for *ἐγνώκασι*), 2d Aorists and Imperfects like *κατελίποσαν*, *ἐδολιοῦσαν*, 2d Aorists like *εἴδαμεν*, *ἔφυγαν*, the Subjunctive Future § 13, 1. e., the Imperf. *ἤμεθα*. To this head specially belong many tenses, regular indeed according to analogy, but in place of which the earlier language used other forms; as, *ἡμάρτησα* for *ἥμαρτον*, *αὔξω* for *αὐξάνω*, *ἥξα* from *ἥκω*, *φάγομαι* for *ἔδομαι*, etc.; indeed, the multiplication of tense and mood forms, of which for euphony's sake only a few had been previously in use, is one of the characteristics of the later language. Further, many nouns received a new
35 gender, as *ἡ* for *ὁ βάτος*, and acquired thus a twofold declension; as,
6th ed. *πλοῦτος*, *ἔλεος*; see § 9 note 2, p. 65.

Peculiarities of *syntax* are less numerous in the later language, — appearing chiefly in a careless use of the moods with particles. The following are instances under this head in the N. T.: *ὅταν* with the Indic. Pret., *εἰ* with the Subj., *ἵνα* with the Indic. Pres., verbs such as *γεύεσθαι*, *καταδικάζειν* construed with the Acc., *προσκυνεῖν* and *προσφωνεῖν* with Dat. of pers. (see Lob. 463; Mtth. II. 902), the weakening of *ἵνα* in phrases like *θέλω ἵνα*, *ἄξιος ἵνα*, etc., the employment of the Gen. Inf. (*τοῦ ποιεῖν*) beyond its original and natural bounds, the use of the Subj. for the Optat. in narration after Preterites, and in general the infrequent use of the

Optat., which in Modern Greek has entirely disappeared. Μέλλειν, θέλειν, etc., are more commonly followed by the Aor. Inf. (Lob. 747). The neglect of declension is just beginning to appear; thus, μετὰ τοῦ ἕν, and the like (which is, however, put designedly), § 10 end. Subsequently the misapplication of cases and tenses in some instances also occurs. Thus σύν with the Gen. in Niceph. Tact. (Hase ad Leon. Diac. p. 38), ἀπό with the Acc. in Leo Grammat. (p. 232) and then in Modern Greek, the interchange of the Aor. and Pres. participles in Leo Diac. and elsewhere. The Dual was gradually superseded by the Plural.

In a *grammatical* point of view the N. T. idiom bears few traces of *Hebrew* influence. True, the grammatical structure of the Hebrew 50
(Aramaic) language differs essentially from that of the Greek; but this 37
must have tended rather to prevent the Greek-speaking Jews from mixing 7th ed.
vernacular with Greek constructions. (Such mixture of constructions would be far easier to a German in speaking Latin or French.) Besides, every one makes the *grammatical* laws of a foreign language his own, more easily than he does its store of words and phrases and its general idiomatic peculiarities (cf. Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 73). This is so because the rules of syntax are but few in comparison with the number of words and phrases, and because these rules too (especially the principal ones, which are fundamental to accurate, not elegant, composition) by oral intercourse are far more frequently brought before the mind. The Jews, therefore, must have been able readily to acquire such a mastery of the grammatical rules of the Greek then current — which by no means possessed all the niceties of Attic — as sufficed for their simple mode of communicating their thoughts. Even the Seventy have succeeded for the most part in recasting Hebrew constructions into accurate Greek.[1] Only a few vernacular idioms of frequent occurrence, and not at variance with the rules of Greek Grammar, have been retained to the letter (such as instead of the Optat. an interrogative clause expressing a wish, 2 Sam. 36
xv. 4, *τίς με καταστήσει κριτήν;* xxiii. 15; Num. xi. 29; Deut. v. 26; 6th ed.
xxviii. 67; Cant. viii. 1[2]), or, where it could be done, rendered in accordance at least with Greek analogy (as, *θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε* Gen. iii. 4, מוֹת תָּמוּתוּן Deut. xx. 17; 1 Sam. xiv. 39; Isa. xxx. 19) or by a construction already usual in Greek (see, however, § 45, 8), Judg. xv. 2 *μισῶν ἐμίσησας* for שָׂנֹא שְׂנֵאתָ, Gen. xliii. 2; Ex. xxii. 17; xxiii. 26; 1 Sam. ii. 25, etc.;

[1] Certain Greek idioms became quite habitual to them, such as the article with qualifying words and phrases after a noun (*ὁ κύριος ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ*, and the like), the attraction of the relative, etc. Negatives, also, they almost always distinguish correctly. The more extended use of the Greek cases is exhibited by the better translators, as e.g. Gen. xxvi. 10, *μικροῦ ἐκοιμήθη it wanted little that*, etc.

[2] Cf. Rom. vii. 24, where *Fr.* adduces similar instances from Greek poets. The construction with *πῶς* (*ἄν*) followed by the Optat. or Subjunct. is discussed by *Schaefer*, ad Soph. Oed. Col. p. 523, and Melet. p. 100.

cf. also Inf. with τοῦ.[1] Hebrew constructions thoroughly repugnant to the genius of the Greek, the Septuagint have usually rejected. For instance, the Fem. for the Neut. occurs only in a few passages, where the translators have not duly adverted to the meaning of the text, or have given it a nervously literal rendering; as, Ps. cxix. 50; cxviii. 23;[2] and it is hardly
38 allowable to suppose that they designedly employed it for the Neut. In
7th ed. other passages the Heb. Fem. refers manifestly to a feminine subject indi-
51 cated in the context; as, Judges xix. 30. On the other hand, ἐν ταύτῃ in Neh. xiii. 14 is probably equivalent to ταύτῃ in Greek authors, *in this respect, hoc in genere* (Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 5) or *therefore* (cf. ταύτῃ ὅτι *propterea quod*, Xen. Anab. 2, 6, 7); see also 1 Sam. xi. 2. The construction of Hebrew verbs with prepositions is imitated oftenest; as, φείδεσθαι ἐπί τινι Deut. vii. 16, or ἐπί τινα Ezek. vii. 4, οἰκοδομεῖν ἔν τινι Neh. iv. 10 (בָּנָה בְּ), ἐπερωτᾶν ἐν κυρίῳ (שָׁאַל בַּיהוָה) 1 Sam. x. 22, εὐδοκεῖν ἔν τινι (חָפֵץ בְּ Fr. Rom. II. 371). These imitations sound harsh in Greek, it must be confessed, yet in that flexible idiom they might find some point of affinity. (Cf. the Germ. bauen *an* etwas, fragen *bei*, etc.)

Even, however, if the Septuagint contained numerous other slavish imitations of Hebrew constructions, that would prove nothing in reference to the N. T. idiom. For, as has already been said, the style of these translators who, moreover, adhered for the most part with rigid exactness to the very letter of the Hebrew, — which sometimes indeed they did not even understand, — was by no means the model followed by the Jews in original composition or conversation. So far as regards the several rules of grammar, the N. T. is written thoroughly in Greek, and the few undoubted grammatical Hebraisms it contains become hardly discernible.

37 To Hebraisms of this sort may be referred, with more or less assurance,[3]
6th ed. the use of prepositions where the Greeks employ cases alone (ἀποκρύπτειν τι ἀπό τινος, ἐσθίειν ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων, ἀθῶος ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος, κοινωνὸς ἔν τινι, ἀρέσκειν and προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιόν τινος, εὐδοκεῖν and θέλειν ἔν τινι). Many such peculiarities, however, pertain to antique simplicity, and are accordingly in use among the Greeks themselves, especially the poets, and con-

[1] *Hemsterhuis*, ad Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3: saepenumero contingit, ut locutio quaedam native graeca a LXX. interpretib. et N. T. scriptoribus mutata paululum potestate ad hebraeam apte exprimendam adhibeatur.

[2] The translation of the Psalms is, in general, one of the most heedless. That of Nehemiah is little better. Aquila, who translated word for word (absurdly rendering for instance, the nota acc. אֵת by σύν), cannot be taken into consideration at all in an inquiry into the grammatical character of Hellenistic Greek. In order to give a literal translation he violates without hesitation the rules of grammar; as, Gen. i. 5, ἐκάλεσεν ὁ θεὸς τῷ φωτὶ ἡμέρα. And yet he always uses the article with propriety, and even employs the attraction of the relative; so deeply were both rooted in the Greek language!

[3] Imaginary Hebraisms are, the supposed *Plur. excell.*, the ב *essentiae*, combinations erroneously regarded as circumlocutions for the superlative like σάπιγξ τοῦ θεοῦ, the use of the Fem. for the Neut., and probably the Hypallage already mentioned τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης for ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς.

sequently do not exactly conflict with the genius of the language; as, παύειν ἀπό τινος.

Special and more decided instances are:

a. The verbal imitation of such Hebrew constructions as offend against Greek propriety; as, ὁμολογεῖν ἔν τινι, βλέπειν ἀπό *sibi cavere a*, προσέθετο πέμψαι, εἰ δοθήσεται as a form of negatory oath;

b. The repetition of a word to denote distribution, as δύο δύο *bini*, instead of ἀνὰ δύο;

c. The imitation of the Inf. absol. (see above);

d. The use of the Gen. of an abstract noun for the kindred adjective, and probably the very frequent use of the Inf. with a preposition (and its 52
subject in the Acc.) in narration.

The peculiarities classed under a. and b. may be regarded as *pure* Hebraisms.

When, however, it is considered that by far the majority of constructions in the N. T. are genuine Greek, and that the N. T. writers have constantly employed such peculiarities of Greek syntax[1] as differed entirely 39
from their vernacular idiom, — as the distinction of the different past 7th ed.
tenses, the use of ἄν with verbs, the attraction of the relative, such an expression as οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι, the use of the Sing. with Neuters, etc., — we shall not be disposed to join in the cry about countless grammatical Hebraisms in the N. T. That the diction of the N. T. is grammatically far less Hebraistic than that of the Septuagint and the Palestinean Apocrypha, as might naturally be expected, will be manifest, if, when the expressions just specified as Hebraistic are observed in the Septuagint, it is also noticed that many a vernacular idiom in the LXX. never occurs in the N. T., or (such as an interrogative clause for the Opt.) only in solitary cases in impassioned style. A circumlocution for the Fut., as ἔσομαι διδόναι Tob. v. 14, or the repetition of a substantive to denote *every* (Num. ix. 10; 2 Kings xvii. 29; 1 Chron. ix. 27), never occurs there.[2]

The N. T. writers considered separately exhibit extremely few purely 38
grammatical peculiarities. Only the book of Rev. requires particular, 6th ed.
though not exceptional, attention in a treatise on the grammar of the N. T.

Finally, throughout the investigation into the grammatical character of the N. T. diction, it is obvious that the diversity of readings must be carefully attended to; on the other hand, it is also plain that verbal criticism can be successfully practised only in connection with a thorough acquaintance with the linguistic (lexical) peculiarities of the several N. T. writers.

[1] The more refined elegances of literary Attic are not to be found in the N. T., partly because they were unknown in the popular language adopted by the N. T. writers, partly because they were unsuited to the simple cast of thought of the sacred authors.

[2] Yet in the better translated portions of the O. T. and in the Palestin. Apocrypha we find single Greek constructions, on the other hand, instead of which the authors of the N. T. use the corresponding Hebraisms; thus, in 3 Esr. vi. 10; Tob. iii. 8, the Gen. is used with strict Grecian propriety. Further, cf. *Thiersch*, de Pentat. alex. p. 95 sq.

40
7th ed.
39
6th ed.
53

PART II.

THE GRAMMATICAL FORMS AS RESPECTS THEIR FORMATION. (INFLECTION.)

§ 5. ORTHOGRAPHY AND ORTHOGRAPHIC PRINCIPLES.

1. The best manuscripts of the N. T. (like those of the Greek classics, see Poppo, Thuc. I. 214; Mtth. I. 133) exhibit extraordinary variations of orthography, especially in regard to particular words and forms. Amid such diversity it cannot always be determined on satisfactory grounds what is correct. However, editors of the text should lay down precise rules, and carry them out consistently.

Though the various Codd. have recently been collated with greater diplomatic exactness, still, on many points, a more careful settlement of the facts is to be desired.

We submit the following remarks:

a. The use of an apostrophe to prevent a hiatus is of much rarer occurrence in the Codd. of the N. T. and of the Sept., than in the texts of native Greek authors (especially the orators; cf. G. E. Benseler, de hiatu in scriptorib. gr. P. I. Friberg. 1841. 8vo.; the same, de hiatu in Demosth. Friberg. 1847. 4to.): *ἄμα*, *ἄρα*, *ἆρα*, *γέ*, *ἐμέ*, *ἔτι*, *ἵνα*, *ὥστε*, never suffer elision of the last vowel; *δέ* (before *ἄν*) and *οὐδέ* very seldom (Matt. xxiii. 16 and 18; xxiv. 21; Rom. ix. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 21; Heb. viii. 4; Luke x. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 16; xi. 21; Phil. ii. 18; 1 John ii. 5; iii. 17). Only the prepositions *ἀπό*, *διά*, *ἐπί*, *παρά*, *μετά*, and the conjunction *ἀλλά* regularly suffer elision, the former particularly before pronouns and in phrases of frequent occurrence, as *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, etc.; *ἀντί* only in *ἀνθ' ὧν*. Yet the manuscripts vary in those cases, and even the best in particular passages, especially in regard to *ἀλλά*. Thus the Cod. Alex. [Sin.] and some others, have in Acts xxvi. 25 *ἀλλὰ ἀληθείας*; vii. 39 *ἀλλὰ ἀπώσαντο*; 2 Pet. ii. 5 *ἀλλὰ*

ὄγδοον. The best Codd. have 2 Cor. xii. 14 ἀλλὰ ὑμᾶς, and Gal. iv. 7 ἀλλὰ υἱός. So also the authority of manuscripts is in favor of, Luke ii. 36 μετὰ ἀνδρός; xiv. 31 μετὰ εἴκοσι; 2 Cor. vi. 15 μετὰ ἀπίστου; Rev. xxi. 13 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν; Heb. xi. 34 ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, 41
Jude 14 ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ; 2 Cor. v. 7 διὰ εἴδους. Cf. also Acts ix. 6; 7th ed.
x. 20; xvi. 37; 2 Cor. iv. 2; v. 12; Luke xi. 17 ἐπὶ οἶκον; Matt. 54
xxi. 5 ἐπὶ ὄνον, etc. There is a preponderance of authority for 40
Luke iii. 2 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως, and Matt. xxiv. 7 ἐπὶ ἔθνος; 1 Cor. vi. 11 8th ed.
ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε; whereas the authority is equal in Rom. vii. 13 for ἀλλὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία and the other reading. Cf. besides, Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 125. That among Ionic authors the same indifference about shunning a hiatus prevails is well known; and accordingly this peculiarity in the N. T. is styled by the earlier biblical philologists an Ionism. Elision is neglected, however, by Attic prose authors, though the instances which Georgi produces from Plato cannot all be trusted (Hierocrit. N. T. I. p. 143). See Bttm. I. S. 123 ff.; Heupel, Marc. p. 33; Benseler, Exc. to his edition of Isocr. Areop. p. 385 sqq.; Jacobs, praef. ad Aelian. anim. p. 29 sq.; Thucyd. ed. Poppo III. II. 358. Perhaps this variation is not without principle, as e.g. Sintenis (Plutarch. vit. IV. p. 321 sqq.) has reduced to rules the use of the hiatus in Plutarch. In the N. T., too, the omission of the elision might be occasionally traced to the writer's intent, on one ground or another; not that the apostles bestowed attention on such things, but so far as they were guided by an instinctive sense of propriety. On this point, however, there is a risk of trifling (Bengel on 1 Cor. vi. 11)

Even in Lchm. the poetic quotation from Menander, 1 Cor. xv. 33, is written with the elision — χρῆσθ' (for χρηστὰ) ὁμιλίαι κακαί; cf. Georgi, Hierocrit. I. 186. The best Codd., however, of the N. T. [Sin. also] have χρηστά, which Tdf. has adopted.

b. In regard to final ς in οὕτως, μέχρις, and the so-called ν ἐφελκυστικόν (Voemel, de ν et ς adductis literis. Fcf. a. M. 1853. 4to; Haake, Beiträge z. griech. Grammat. I. Heft), editors have mostly followed the known rule, which, however, has been restricted by more recent grammarians (Bttm. I. 92 ff.). But it is more advisable to be guided in every case by the authority of the best Codd., and accordingly recent N. T. critics have printed οὕτως and ν ἐφελκυστικόν throughout, agreeably to the uncial Codd. (Tdf. praef. ad N. T. p. xxiii. [ed. vii. p. liii.]). Critics have tried to deduce from the Greek prose authors a fixed rule for determining when οὕτως or οὕτω, εἶπεν or εἶπε, etc., should be used (Bornem.

de gemina Cyrop. recens. p. 89, whom Poppo in his Index to the Cyrop. follows; Frotscher, Xen. Hier. p. 9; Bremi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. 3 and 4; Schäf. Demosth. I. p. 207; Mätzner, ad Antiphont. p. 192), and it is in itself not unlikely that the more careful authors were guided in this by euphony (Franke in Jahn's Jahrb. 1842. S. 247)
42 and other considerations,[1] though ancient grammarians affirm
7th ed. (Bekkeri Anecd. III. p. 1400) that even the Attics wrote *ν ἐφελ-*
41 *κυστικόν* indiscriminately before consonants even (Jacobs, praef.
6th ed. ad Aelian. anim. p. 23 sq.), and so it appears in the Codd.; cf.
55 also Bachmann, Lycophr. I. 156 sq.; Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 185 sq. On *μέχρι* and *μέχρις*, *ἄχρι* and *ἄχρις* in particular, see Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 479. According to the grammarians the Attic orthography requires *μέχρι* and *ἄχρι* even before a vowel (Th. M. p. 135; Phryn. p. 14; cf. Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. 8, 6, 20), and so they are printed by recent editors; cf. Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 183. and Sympos. p. 128; Schäf. Plutarch. V. p. 268. See in general Klotz, Devar. p. 231. Yet even in Attic authors good Codd. have not unfrequently the form with ς. In the N. T. the best Codd. give *μέχρι* invariably, and *ἄχρι* even before vowels, Acts xi. 5; xxviii. 15; but *ἄχρις οὗ*, Rom. xi. 25; 1 Cor. xi. 26; xv. 25, etc., preponderates (also Acts vii. 18).

Codd. vary also as to *ν* in *εἴκοσι*, but the best are said to omit it, see Tdf. praef. ad N. T. p. 23 [ed. vii. p. 54], though in the appar. this matter is but seldom noticed. On *ἄντικρυς*, as most authorities [Sin. also] have in Acts xx. 15, not *ἀντικρύ*, see Lob. Phryn. p. 443 sq.; Bttm. II. 366.

c. In compounds whose first part ends in ς, Knapp, after Wolf (liter. Analect. 1 Bd. S. 460 ff.; cf. Krüg. S. 12), introduced the form ς for *σ*, and has been followed in this by Schulz and Fr., e.g. *ὥςπερ*, *ὅςτις*, *δύςκολος*, *εἰςφέρειν*. Still, Matthiae's objections (I. S. 26) deserve great consideration; and this orthography, as it has no historic warrant, has no great claim to adoption. Schneider in Plato, and Lchm. in the N. T., write *ὥσπερ*, *εἰσακούειν*, etc. Hm., however, committed himself to the former method. That it is inadmissible in such words as *πρεσβύτερος*, *βλασφημεῖν*, *τελεσφορεῖν*, is obvious.

d. Of more importance than all this is the unusual mode of spelling certain words and classes of words which is found even

[1] The disputed question, whether *οὕτως* or *οὕτω* was the original spelling (for the former see *Schäf.* Plutarch. V. p. 219, for the latter *Bttm.* II. 264), and whether *ν ἐφελκ.* really belongs to the forms to which it is annexed (see *Rost*, Gramm. S. 71; *Krü.* 30) is not relevant here.

in the manuscripts of the N. T. and has been almost without exception adopted into the text by Lchm. and Tdf. This comprehends peculiarities of Alexandrian orthography (and pronunciation). We notice the following particulars:

1. For ἕνεκα we find in MSS. (and in the text. rec.) several times the Ionic form εἵνεκα or εἵνεκεν (Wolf, Dem. Lept. p. 388; Georgi, Hierocr. I. 182), elsewhere ἕνεκεν: the last e.g. Matt. xix. 29; Rom. viii. 36; the first Luke iv. 18; 2 Cor. iii. 10; vii. 12. The authority of good Codd. must alone here decide; cf. Poppo, Cyrop. p. xxxix and Ind. Cyrop. and W. m. Buttm. II. 369. In the N. T. at least no distinction can be fixed between the two forms; Weber, Demosth. 403 sq. See also Bremi, exc. VI. ad Lysiam p. 443 sqq. 43 7th ed 56

2. According to good MSS. even of the N. T. (e.g. Codd. [Sin. and] Cantabr.) and according to the Etymol. Mag. ἐννενήκοντα Matt. xviii. 12, 13; Luke xv. 4, 7, is better written ἐνενήκοντα; see Bttm. I. 277; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 47. So also ἔνατος occurs according to good Codd. in Matt. xx. 5; xxvii. 45; Luke xxiii. 44; Acts x. 30, etc.; cf. also Rinck, lucubratt. p. 33, a form very common in Greek prose authors (see Schäf. Melet. p. 32; Scholiast ad Apollon. Argon. 2, 788), and also found in the Rosetta Inscription, 4th line. It was preferred by Bengel, appar. ad Matt. xx. 5. 42 6th ed

3. The Ionic form (Mtth. I. 54) τέσσερες, τεσσεράκοντα occurs several times in good Codd. (particularly Alex. [Sin.] and Ephraemi); e.g. Acts iv. 22; vii. 42; xiii. 18; Rev. xi. 2; xiii. 5; xiv. 1; xxi. 17, and Lchm. and Tdf. have admitted it into the text. It frequently occurs also in Codd. of the Sept. (Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 118). In these ancient documents, however, α and ε are often interchanged, and one would scarcely consent to write Matt. viii. 3 ἐκαθερίσθη, Luke xvii. 14 ἐκαθερίσθησαν, or Heb. x. 2 κεκαθερισμένους with A, and the like.

4. For βαλάντιον in every place where it occurs, Luke x. 4; xii. 33; xxii. 35, 36, good Codd. have βαλλάντιον, and this Lchm. and Tdf. have printed. Also in MSS. of Greek authors we find this doubling both in βαλλάντιον itself (Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 100) and in its derivatives. Bekker in his Plato has adopted it. Yet see Dindorf, Aristoph. ran. 772, and Schneider, Plat. civ. I. p. 75, III. p. 38. The word κράββατος is but seldom written with a single β (and then mostly κράβαττος).

5. As to ὑποπιάζω (ὑποπιέζω) for ὑπωπιάζω (from ὑπώπιον), Luke xviii. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 27 var., see Lob. p. 461. It is probably merely a mistake of the copyists; for Paul undoubtedly used the more characteristic ὑπωπιάζω and that has now long stood in the text. Whether we should write ἀνώγαιον or ἀνάγαιον can hardly be determined, the authorities for each being nearly equal. The former is derived from the adv. ἄνω, the latter from ἀνά (Fr. Mr. 611). See, besides, Lob. p. 297.

6. The well-known controversy about the right way of spelling adverbs in ι or ει (Hm. Soph. Ai. p. 183; Sturz, opusc. p. 229 sqq.), affects the

N. T. only in regard to πανοικί Acts xvi. 34; cf. Plat. Eryx. 392 c.; Aesch. dial. 2, 1; Joseph. Antt. 4, 4, 4; 3 Macc. iii. 27. Bloomfield, glossar. in Aesch. Prom. p. 131 sq., is perhaps right in thinking that such adverbs from nouns in ος should be written with ι only (πανοικί, properly πανοικοί,
57 as some Codd. have in Acts, as above). Still, nearly all the Codd. are in favor of ει; see Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 1540; Lob. 515.

7. Should we write Δανίδ or Δαβίδ? See Gersdorf, Sprachchar. I. 44,
44 who leaves it undecided, yet adopts the spelling with β. The Codd. usually
th ed. have it abbreviated, Δ̄δ̄, yet occasionally the older and better, where they give it at full length, have Δανίδ (Δανείδ), as Knapp, Schulz, Fr., Tdf. have printed it. Montfaucon, Palaeograph. graec. 5, 1, decided for the latter. Lchm. has invariably Δανείδ; cf. besides Bleek on Heb. iv. 7.

8. The name of Moses is written Μωϋσῆς in the principal Codd. of the N. T. (as in the Sept. and Josephus), and this has been adopted by Knapp, Schulz, Lchm., Tdf. Still, it is a question whether this properly Coptic form, which in the Sept. is justifiable, should not in the N. T. give place to the form Μωσῆς, which comes nearer the Hebrew and is certainly more
43 usual; this passed over also to the Greeks (Strabo 16, 760 sq.) and
6th ed. Romans, and has been retained by Scholz. On the diaeresis in Μωϋσῆς, dropped by Lchm., see Fr. Rom. II. 313.

9. As to Κολοσσαί and Κολασσαί see the expositors on Col. i. 1. The first of these forms is found not only on the coins of that city (Eckhel, doctrina numor. vett. I. III. 147), but also in the best Codd. of the classics (cf. Xen. Anab. 1, 2, 6); hence it was preferred by Valckenaer, ad Her. 7, 30. In the N. T., however, the form with α has more authority, and has been adopted by Lchm. and Tdf. It exhibits probably the popular pronunciation.

10. For ἐννεός Acts ix. 7, it is better to write ἐνεός (cf. ἄνεως), agreeably to the best Codd.

11. The un-Attic form οὐθείς, οὐθέν, is found altogether in the N. T. only in single though good Codd., Luke xxiii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 2 f.; 2 Cor. xi. 8; Acts xv. 9; xix. 27: μηθέν Acts xxiii. 14; xxvii. 33; see Lob. Phryn. p. 181 sq. It occurs also in the Sept. (Bornem. Act. p. 115) and in Greek papyrus rolls.

12. Ἐθύθη 1 Cor. v. 7, text. rec., for which all the better Codd. have ἐτύθη (Bttm. I. 78), is unusual, but rests on an unexceptionable retaining of the radical θ where there is no reduplication (λιθωθῆναι, καθορθῆναι), though both the verbs θύειν and θεῖναι (the only ones of which the stem begins with θ and which form a 1st Aor.) change the radical θ in the 1st Aor. into τ (Lob. Paralip. 45). The participle θυθείς, analogous in form to the above example, occurs in Dio Cass. 45, 17. (In Aesch. Choëph. 242, the editions have τυθείς). It is not improbable that the first form was employed by Paul, and suppressed by the copyists.

13. For χρεωφειλέτης the best Codd. have χρεοφειλέτης Luke vii. 41;

xvi. 5, which Zonaras rejects, and it occurs only once in the MSS. of Greek authors; see Lob. Phryn. p. 691.

14. The rough mutes for the smooth in ἔφιδε Acts iv. 29, and ἀφίδω Phil. ii. 23, Lchm. has already adopted on the authority of MSS. Other similar forms are ἐφ' ἐλπίδι 1 Cor. ix. 10; ἀφελπίζοντες Luke vi. 35; οὐχ ὄψεσθε Luke xvii. 22; οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς Gal. ii. 14; οὐχ ὀλίγος Acts xii. 18, etc., (cf. Bornem. Acta, p. 24). Analogous forms occur in the Sept. 58
(Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 127) and in Greek inscriptions (Böckh, Inscript. I. 301. and II. 774), and are explained by the fact that many of those words, as ἐλπίς, ἰδεῖν, had been pronounced with the digamma.

15. Πραΰς and πραύτης appear in the N. T. to be the better attested readings, though Photius, in his Lexicon, p. 386, Lips., prefers πρᾶος; yet 45
see Lob. Phryn. p. 403 sq. 7th ed.

16. Ἐχθές (not χθές, Lob. path. p. 47) Lchm. has already received into the text, agreeably to the best Codd.

2. Whether such words as διὰ τί, ἵνα τί, διά γε, ἀλλά γε, ἀπ' ἄρτι, τοῦτ' ἔστι should be written separate or united, can hardly be determined on any general principle; and the matter is of the less moment as the best Codd. themselves vary extremely. Knapp has printed most such words combined; and, in fact, two small words in expressions of frequent recurrence are wont readily to blend thus in pronunciation (as the crases in διό, διότι, καθά, ὥστε, 44
also μηκέτι and others, show). Schulz, on the contrary, defends 6th ed.
their separation. Would he write also εἴ γε, τοι νῦν, οὐκ ἔτι, etc.? How much the Codd. in the main favor their junction may be seen from Poppo, Thuc. I. p. 455. Schulz himself, too, has printed διαπαντός Mark v. 5, Luke xxiv. 53; and Schneider in his Plato follows almost invariably the united mode of writing them. Many inconveniences, however, would arise from carrying out strictly either mode of writing; and as the oldest and best Codd. of the N. T. are written continuously, thus affording no guidance on this point, it would probably be advisable constantly to combine such words in the N. T. in the following cases: a. Where the language supplies an obvious analogy, e.g. οὐκέτι like μηκέτι, τοιγάρ like τοίνυν, ὅστις cf. ὅτου. b. Where one of the words does not elsewhere occur separately (in prose); therefore, εἴπερ, καίπερ. c. When an enclitic follows a monosyllable or dissyllable with which it usually constitutes a single idea, as εἴτε, εἴγε, ἄραγε; but not διάγε τὴν ἀναίδειαν Luke xi. 8 (Lchm. divides). d. Where the words have a different signification according as they are separated or united; as, ὁστισοῦν *quicumque*, but ὅς τις οὖν Matt. xviii. 4 *quisquis igitur* (Bttm. I. 308), ἐξαυτῆς adv. and ἐξ αὐτῆς (not to mention οὐδείς

and οὐδ' εἷς). The former οὖν, however, is usually found disunited in the Codd., and by the authors themselves is sometimes separated by the interposition of a conjunction; see Jacobs, praef. Aelian. anim. p. 25. As for the rest, much must be left to the editor's judgment in each particular instance. However, he could hardly find clear ground for writing διαπαντός, or even ὑπερεγώ (2 Cor.
59 xi. 23, Lchm.) and the like; although in general it must not be forgotten that in the language of the N. T., as closely approaching popular speech, orthographic combinations are especially frequent.

In the editions of the N. T. the pronoun ὅ,τι was invariably so written (with the hypodiastole), Luke x. 35; Jno. ii. 5; xiv. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; etc., till Lchm., after Bekker, introduced ὅ τι (as ὅς τις, ἥ τις). Some
46 think even this separation unnecessary (as Schneider, Plat. civ. I. praef.
7th ed. p. 48 sq.); cf. Jen. Lit. Z. 1809, IV. 174. The non-separation, besides other recommendations, has in its favor the consideration that an arbitrary exposition of the text is not forced upon the reader. (In the N. T. particularly it has often been doubtful which of the two is to be read, as Jno. viii. 25; Acts ix. 27; 2 Cor. iii. 14.) Once, however, we decide between pron. and conj., it is safest to write ὅ τι with a space, or even to retain the hypodiastole.

3. Crasis[1] occurs on the whole but seldom, and only in particular forms of frequent recurrence. In these, however, it is found almost without var. The most common instances are κἀγώ, κἄν, κἀκεῖ,
45 κἀκεῖθεν, κἀκεῖνος, also κἀμοί, Luke i. 3; Acts viii. 19; 1 Cor. iii. 1;
8th ed. xv. 8; κἀμέ, Jno. vii. 28; 1 Cor. xvi. 4; τοὐναντίον, 2 Cor. ii. 7; Gal. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iii. 9; once τοὔνομα, Matt. xxvii. 57. On the other hand, good Codd. have throughout τὰ αὐτά, Luke vi. 23; xvii. 30; 1 Thess. ii. 14. Instances like τουτέστι, καθά, καθάπερ, are not properly called crasis.

Contraction, where usual, is rarely neglected; cf. on ὄστεα, χειλέων, νοΐ, and the like §§ 8 and 9, besides ἐδέετο, Luke viii. 38, according to the best Codd., cf. Fr. de conform. crit. p. 32, as often in Xenoph. See Bttm. II. 150; Lob. 220. The verb καμμύειν exhibits a contraction of a peculiar sort; cf. Lob. 340.

There is good authority for καὶ ἐκεῖ, Matt. v. 23; xxviii. 10; Mark i. 35, 38; καὶ ἐκεῖθεν, Mark x. 1; καὶ ἐκείνοις, Matt. xx. 4, etc.

4. In the earlier editions of the N. T. the Iota subscript [2] was too frequently introduced. This abuse was first censured by Knapp. The iota must be decidedly rejected:

[1] *Ahrens*, de crasi et aphaeresi. Stollberg, 1845. 4to.

[2] Cf. *K. H. A. Lipsius*, grammat. Untersuch. über die biblische Gräcität. Leipz. 8vo S. 3 ff.]

a. In cases of crasis with *και* when the first syllable of the second word does not contain an *ι* (as *κᾆτα* from *καὶ εἶτα*), therefore in *κἀγώ*, *κἀμοί*, *κἀκεῖνος*, *κἄν*, *κἀκεῖ*, *κἀκεῖθεν*, etc. See Hm. Vig. p. 526; Bttm. I. 114. The *ι* subs., however, is defended by Thiersch, Gr. § 38 note 1, and Poppo has retained it in Thucyd. after the best MSS. (Thuc. II. I. p. 149).

b. In the 2d perf. and 1st aor. act. of the verb *αἴρω* and its compounds, thus e.g. *ἦρκεν* Col. ii. 14; *ἆραι* Matt. xxiv. 17; *ἆρον* Matt. 60
ix. 6; *ἦραν* Matt. xiv. 12; *ἄρας* 1 Cor. vi. 15, etc. See Bttm. I. 413, 439; Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 150.

c. In the Doric Inf., used also by the Attics (Mtth. I. 148), *ζῆν*, *διψῆν*, *πεινῆν*, *χρῆσθαι*. According to ancient grammarians[1] (who flourished after Christ) the iota ought to be rejected also in contract verbs in *άω*; as *ἀγαπᾶν*, *ὁρᾶν*, *τιμᾶν*, probably inasmuch as these forms arose from (the Doric) *τιμάεν*, like *μισθοῦν* from 47
μισθόεν; see Wolf in the lit. Analekten 1 Bd. S. 419 ff. Bengel 7th ed.
favored this form, and it has been defended and followed by several scholars (Reiz, Lucian. IV. p. 393 sq. ed. Bp.; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. v. 69, and praef. ad Soph. Oedip. R. p. 9 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 14 sq.). Bttm. I. 490, and Mtth. I. 437, declare themselves undecided, and many editors have retained the old mode of writing (as Lobeck, cf. his technol. p. 188). Schulz, Lchm. and Tdf., however, have rejected the *ι* subs. from the N. T.; cf. Eph. v. 28; Rom. xiii. 8; Mark viii. 32; John xvi. 19.

d. There is nothing decisive for *πρῷος* (Lob. Phryn. 403; pathol. serm. gr. p. 442), yet see Bttm. I. 255. Neither has *πρωΐ*, from *πρό*, an *ι* subs.; see as to this word in general, Bttm. ad Plat. Crit. p. 43, and Lexilog. 17, 2.

e. As to *πάντη* Acts xxiv. 3, see Bttm. II. 360. The *ι*, which has a right to stand in *ἄλλῃ*, *ταύτῃ*, as actual Datives, should be rejected in *πάντη*, which has no corresponding Nom. The old 46
grammarians, however, are of a different opinion (Lob. paralip. 6th ed.
56 sq.), and Lchm. has printed *πάντῃ*. Also *κρυφῇ* (Dor. *κρυφᾷ*) Eph. v. 12, cf. Xen. conv. 5, 8, and *εἰκῇ* (Bttm. II. 342) have been received into the N. T. text; cf. Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 150. Lchm. still writes *λάθρᾳ*, though *λάθρα* is more correct; Schneider, Plat. civ. I. p. 61 praef.; Ellendt, lex. Soph. II. p. 3 sq. Lastly,

f. Since Lchm. *ἀθῷον* stands in the text of the N. T. Matt. xxvii. 4, 24 (*ἀθῴϊον*, Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 1267), cf. also Weber,

[1] Cf. Vig. p. 220. See also Gregor. Choerobosc. Dictata ed. Gaisford, tom. II. p. 721. Yet see Hm. Vig. 748.

Demosth. p. 231; but contrary to all tradition, Lob. pathol. graec. serm. p. 440.[1]

After the example of Bekker and others, Lchm. began, in the larger edition of his N. T., to reject the breathings over double ρ as useless; but he has found no followers [except Tdf. ed. vii.]. That the Romans also heard an aspiration in the middle of words is clear from the orthography of Pyrrhus, Tyrrhenus, etc. Bttm. I. S. 28. Still less can one bring one's self to omit the breathing also over ρ at the beginning of a word, as some
61 do; see in opposition Rost, Gramm. S. 17 f. [or, as Lchm. does, to mark with a *smooth* breathing the first ρ in words the first two syllables of which begin with ρ; see in opposition Göttling, Accentl. p. 205].

The Alexandrians (Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 116 sqq.) had, as it is admitted, their peculiar Greek orthography, which not only interchanged letters (as αι and ει, ε and η, ι and ει, cf. εἰδέα Matt. xxviii. 3, γ and κ), but even added superfluous ones, to strengthen the forms of words; as, ἐκχθές, βασιλέαν, νύκταν, φθάννειν, ἐκχυννόμενον, ἔσσπειρε, ἀναβαίννον, ἤλλατο (Acts xiv. 10; vii. 26; cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 210). On the other hand, necessary
48 letters (when doubled) they rejected; as, δυσεβής, σάβασι, ἀντάλαγμα, φύλα,
7th ed. ἐρύσατο, ἄραφος (Jno. xix. 23). They disregarded, too, the methods by which the Greeks avoided a harsh concurrence of many or of dissimilar consonants (Bttm. I. 75 ff.); as, λήμψομαι, ἀναλημφθείς (Bttm. II. 231), προσωπολημψία, ἀπεκτάνκασι, ἐνχώριον, συνκάλυμμα, συνρητεῖν, συνπνίγειν, συνμαθητής, πένπει. These peculiarities are found, partly in good MSS. of the Sept. and of the N. T. (Tdf. praef. ad N. T. p. 20 sq. [ed. vii. p. 46 sqq.]) which are said to have been executed in Egypt, e.g. Cod. Alex., [Cod. Sin.], Cod. Vatic., Cod. Ephraem. (ed. Tdf. p. 21), Cod. Cantabr., Cod. Claromont. (Tdf. prolegg. ad cod. Clarom. p. 18), Cod. Cypr. (see Hug, Einleit. I. S. 238, 242, 244, 245, 247, 249, 254; Scholz, curae crit. in hist. text. evangg. pp. 40, 61); partly in Coptic and Graeco-Coptic documents (see Hug. I. 239), with more or less uniformity. They cannot, therefore, be dismissed as but caprices of the copyists, as Planck thinks (de orat. N. T. indole, p. 25, note), especially as for many of them analogies can be adduced from the older dialects. At the same time, many of them are not specially Alexandrian, as the like occur in Codd. of Greek authors, and in Greek inscriptions, that cannot be traced to an Egyptian origin; as, e.g.
47 ει for ι, εγ for εκ, (on λήμψομαι cf. the Ion. λάμψομαι Mtth. 609); and, on
6th ed. the other hand, many Egyptian documents are tolerably free from the peculiarities in question.

Lchm. and Tdf., on the concurrent testimony of good (but for the most part few) Codd. in Matt. xx. 10; xxi. 22; Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47;

[1] The spelling φόν (*Wessel*, Her. 2, 68), ζῷον, which *Jacobs*, in Aelian. animal., recently adopted on the authority of a good Cod., nobody will be disposed to introduce into the N. T.; still less σῴζειν. Cf. *Lob.* pathol. p. 442.

Acts i. 2, 8, 11, 22; Jas. i. 7; Mark i. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 3; Phil. ii. 25, etc. (sometimes without giving authorities, Matt. xix. 29; John xvi. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 14; Phil. iii. 12; Rom. vi. 8, etc.), have received these forms into the text. Without more convincing proof, however, than what has been produced by Tdf. praef. ad. N. T. p. 19 [ed. vii. p. 45] all the peculiarities of the Alex. dialect, and in particular of the Alex. orthography, should not be attributed to Palestinean writers, (as John, Paul, James); and it is improbable that the N. T. writers should have followed that orthography only in comparatively few instances.[1] Besides, Cod. B in reference to this point has not yet been thoroughly collated. According to what Tdf. has said, as above, p. 21, he might have been expected to adopt such forms more frequently.

The introduction, therefore, of this orthography into the text of the N. T. — if editors choose to imitate on such points the Codd., even in editions intended for general use — must undergo renewed and thorough consideration; and at the same time the question may be raised, whether 62
this orthography was not a mode of spelling adopted by the learned rather 49
than the actual pronunciation of the people, somewhat as in Roman in- 7th ed
scriptions (Schneider, lat. Grammat. I. II. 530 f., 543 f., 566 f. etc.) we find adferre, inlatus, and the like, written according to the etymology.

§ 6. ACCENTUATION. [2]

1. The accentuation of the text of the N. T. is to be regulated, not so much by the authority of the oldest accented Codd. [to which Lipsius, as above, has attached too much importance], as by the established tradition of the grammarians; though much still remains doubtful, and, in the minute researches of later critics, attempts have sometimes been made to introduce subtilties. We select the following observations:

a. According to the ancient grammarians (Moeris, p. 193), ἴδε should be written ἰδέ in Attic authors only, and ἴδε in the remaining (later) writers; just as λαβέ and λάβε are distinguished, Weber, Demosth. p. 173, cf. Bttm. I. 448. Griesb. has so printed (except in Gal. v. 2), and Lchm. everywhere. According to Bornem.'s conjecture (Rosenmüller, exeg. Repert. II. 267), the word should be written ἰδέ when it occurs as an Imper. followed by an Acc. (Rom. xi. 22), and ἴδε when it is merely an exclamation. It is preferable, however, to follow the ancient grammarians.

[1] Of many words, as συλλαμβάνειν, συλλαλεῖν, συμβούλιον, συμπίπτειν, no such form at all has been observed; of others, as συλλέγειν, συγκαλεῖν, συσταυροῦν, ἐγκαλεῖν, only in single passages.

[2] Cf. *Lipsius*, gramm. Unterss. üb. d. bibl. Gräcität. S. 14 ff. S. 33 ff.]

b. Numerals compounded with ἔτος should have the accent on the penult, according to the ancient grammarians (Thom. M. 859;
48 Moschopul. in Sched.), when they are used of *time;* in every other
6th ed. case, on the last. Hence Acts vii. 23 τεσσαρακονταέτης χρόνος, and Acts xiii. 18 τεσσαρακονταέτη χρόνον; on the other hand, ἑκατονταετής, Rom. iv. 19 (cf. Jacobs, Anthol. III. p. 251, 253). This distinction, however, is not observed in the MSS., and the whole rule is doubtful, see Lob. 406 sq. Ammonius, p. 136, exactly reverses the distinction; see Bremi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. 369, ed. Goth.

c. Some would have κήρυξ and φοίνιξ accented κῆρυξ and φοῖνιξ (see Schäf. Gnom. p. 215 sq. and Soph. Philoct. 562, cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 956 sq.) on the ground that, according to ancient grammarians, the υ and ι (in the Nom. Sing.) were pronounced
63 short (Bekker, Anecd. III. 1429). Hm., Soph. Oed. R. p. 145, rejects this as contrary to all analogy. Yet it is a question whether in later Greek the accentuation κῆρυξ, φοῖνιξ is not to be preferred with the grammarians; see Bttm. I. 167. Lchm. has followed it.

d. For ποῦς, as it stood in most of the older editions of the N. T., Knapp restored πούς, because the Gen. has ποδός with short *o*; see Lob. Phryn. 765, and paralip. 93.

e. Griesb. and others have incorrectly written λαίλαψ; it should
50 be λαῖλαψ, as the *a* is short. In the same way, Schulz (though
7th ed. not invariably) and Lchm. write θλῖψις for θλίψις (as λῆψις), because the first ι is long, not by position, but by nature. So κλῖμα, κρῖμα, χρῖσμα, μῖγμα, ψῦχος (cf. Reisig, de constr. antistr. p. 20; Lob. paralip. 418), στῦλος (Passow, under the word), (ῥῖψις and) ῥῖψαν Luke iv. 35. However, it has been rightly remarked by Fr., Rom. I. 107, that as according to the testimony of the ancient grammarians (Lob. Phryn. 107; cf. Dindorf, praef. ad Aristoph. Acharn. p. 15) the later Greeks in many words shortened the penult which was long in Attic, this return to Attic accentuation in the N. T. is not so unquestionably warranted. No editor [except Tdf. ed. vii.] has changed the regular θρῆσκος into θρησκός, though several Codd. so read; see Bengel, app. crit. ad Jac. i. 26.

f. Since the termination αι is considered as short in accentuation (Bttm. I. 54), we must write θυμιᾶσαι Luke i. 9, and κηρῦξαι Luke iv. 19; Acts x. 42, for θυμιάσαι and κηρύξαι (as still written by Knapp); cf. Poppo, Thuc. II. I. 151; Bornem. schol. p. 4. Griesb. and Knapp, in Acts xii. 14, still write erroneously ἑστᾶναι, as *a* is short. On the other hand συντετρῖφθαι Mark v. 4 has already been restored.

g. In the older editions, even in Knapp's, *ἐριθεία* is written *ἐρίθεια*; but, as the word is derived from *ἐριθεύω*, the former accentuation is alone admissible; see Bttm. I. 141, II. 401. So *ἀρεσκεία*, since it comes from *ἀρεσκεύειν* and not *ἀρέσκειν*, must not be accented *ἀρέσκεια* (as both Lchm. and Tdf. accent it).

h. Lchm., agreeably to the undoubted analogy of *γνώστης*, *κλάστης*, etc., changed *κτιστῇ* 1 Pet. iv. 19 (Knapp and Griesb.) into *κτίστῃ*. But Schott and Wahl have retained *κτιστῇ*; yet see Beng. appar. p. 442.

i. As to *μισθωτός* see Schäf. Dem. II. p. 88. The word *φάγος*, 49
Matt. xi. 19; Luke vii. 34, is so accented even in other books 6th ed.
besides the N. T., Lob. Phryn. 434, though from analogy we should expect *φαγός*, Lob. paralip. 135, who decides against Fr. Mr. p. 790 sqq.

k. Lob. Phryn. 348, and Bttm. exc. I. ad Plat. Menon. hold 64
that we should write *εἶπον* 1st Aor. Imp. Acts xxviii. 26, and not *εἰπόν*; yet see reasons worthy of consideration on the other side by Wex, in the Jahrb. für Philol. VI. 169. The former accentuation is limited to standard Attic. For *εἰπόν* in the Greek Bible, see the express testimony of Charax in Bttm. as above, who calls the accentuation Syracusan. The later editors have also retained this form. See, besides, Bornem. Acta, p. 234 sq.

l. Names of Persons, originally oxytone adjectives or appellatives, throw back the accent for the sake of distinction;[1] thus, *Τύχικος* not *Τυχικός*, *Ἐπαίνετος* not *Ἐπαινετός* (Lob. paral. 481), *Φίλητος* 51
not *Φιλητός* (see Bengel app. crit. on the passage), *Ἔραστος* not 7th ed.
Ἐραστός, *Βλάστος* not *Βλαστός*, *Κάρπος* not *Καρπός*, [*Πύῤῥος* not *Πυῤῥός*, *Ἑρμογένης*,] *Σωσθένης* (like *Δημοσθένης*) and *Διοτρέφης* 3 Jno. 9. In the same way we write *Τίμων* for *Τιμῶν*, *Ὀνησίφορος* for *Ὀνησιφόρος*, *Εὐμένης* for *Εὐμενής*. On the other hand *Ὑμέναιος* remains unaltered, as in general there is a reluctance to throw forward the accent in proper names. Hence even proparoxytones, as *Τρόφιμος*, *Ἀσύγκριτος*, [*Εὔτυχος*] retain their accent, Lob. as above. Yet those former examples also occur exceptionally with their original accent in ancient grammarians and in good Codd. (cf. Tdf. prolegg. Cod. Clarom. p. 22; cf. also *Φιλητός* in Euseb. H. E. 6, 21, 2); and the name *Χριστός* was never brought under the preceding rule. See, generally, Reiz de incl. accent. p. 116; Schäf. Dion. H. p. 265; Funkhänel, Demosth. Androt. p. 108 sq.;

[1] So also geographical names; see *Nobbe*, schedae Ptolem. II. (Lips. 1842. 8vo.) p. 17 sq.

particularly Lehrs, de Aristarchi studiis Homer. p. 276 sq. (In the same way also *ἐπέκεινα*, *ἐπίταδε*, *ὑπερέκεινα* were accented, when these forms, compounded of *ἐπ' ἐκεῖνα*, etc., were used as adverbs.)

m. Indeclinable oriental names are regularly accented on the last; (cf. however, *Ἰούδα*, *Θάμαρ*, *Ζοροβάβελ*, *Ἰωάθαμ*, *Ἐλεάζαρ*, and the segholate form *Ἐλιέζερ* Luke iii. 29, *Ἰεζάβελ* Rev. ii. 20 according to good Codd., *Μαθουσάλα* Luke iii. 37). The accent, even on long vowels, is for the most part the acute; as, *Ἰσαάκ*, *Ἰσραήλ*, *Ἰακώβ*, *Γεννησάρ*, *Βηθσαϊδά*, *Βηθεσδά*, *Ἐμμαούς*, *Καφαρναούμ*. On the other hand, the MSS. have *Κανᾶ*, *Γεθσημανῆ* (though there is more authority for *Γεθσημανεῖ*, which Lchm. and Tdf. prefer; see Fr. Mr. p. 626), also *Βηθφαγῆ* (cf. also *Νινευῆ*). Names which occur as indeclinable and as oxytone, Josephus, with whom declension predominates, makes barytone; as, *Ἀβία* (in the N. T. *Ἀβιά*). The oldest MSS. are said (Tdf. prolegg. p. 36 [ed. vii. p. 61]) to give *Πιλᾶτος*, not *Πιλάτος*, as it is usually written
65 even by Lchm. (and by Cardwell in his ed. of Joseph. bell. jud.).
50 Yet even recent editors, agreeably to the Codd., write *Κοριολάνος*
6th ed. (Plutarch. Coriol. c. 11; Dion. H. 6, p. 414, Sylb.), *Κικιννάτος* (Dion. H. 10, p. 650), *Τορκουάτος* (Plut. Fab. Max. c. 9; Dio C. 34, c. 34), *Κοδράτος* (Quadratus) Joseph. antt. 20, 6, *Ὀνοράτος*, etc. As to *Τίτος* and *Τῖτος* see Sinten. Plut. vit. II. 190. For *Φῆλιξ*, not *Φήλιξ*, see Bornem. Acta, p. 198.

The accentuation *ὁμοῖος*, *ἐρῆμος*, *ἑτοῖμος*, *μῶρος* (Boisson. Anecd. V. p. 94), which grammarians (Greg. Cor. p. 12, 20 sqq.) refer to the Ionians and earlier Attics, and which Bekker for instance follows, is certainly inadmissible even in Attic prose (Poppo, Thuc. I. 213. II. I. 150; Bttm. I. 55); still more so in the N. T. On the other hand, we must without doubt
52 invariably write *ἴσος*; cf. Bornem. Luke, p. 4; Fr. Mr. p. 649. The N. T.
7th ed. MSS. have uniformly *ἔσω* for *εἴσω*, though they have always *εἰς* and never *ἐς*. Thuc., on the other hand, who mostly uses *ἐς*, has *εἴσω* 1, 134; see Poppo, I. p. 212. Recent editors reject *ἔσω* in Attic prose; see Schneider, Plat. civ. I. praef. p. 53. (As to the poets, see Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 84 sq. Lips.) As to whether we should write in Jas. i. 15 *ἀποκυεῖ* or *ἀποκύει*, see below, § 15 p. 88.

In regard to the dim. *τεκνίον* as paroxytone, like *τεχνίον* in Athen. 2. 55, see Bttm. II. 441.; later editors, however, prefer *τέχνιον* in Athen. and Plat. rep. 6. 495 d. In the N. T. the only part of *τεκνίον* that occurs is the Plur. *τεκνία*; see Janson in Jahn's Archiv VII. 487. *Ποίμνιον* (from *ποιμένιον*) should be unhesitatingly preferred to *ποιμνίον*, Janson as above, 507. On *ἀδροτής*, *βραδυτής* as oxytones, see Bttm. II. 417. This accord-

ing to the grammarians is the old accentuation, an exception to the rule; Lchm. has, on the other hand, *ἀδρότητι* 2 Cor. viii. 20, but *βραδυτῆτα* 2 Pet. iii. 9. The later Greeks seem to have pronounced these words regularly as paroxytones; Reiz, accent. inclin. p. 109. On *οὔκουν* and *οὐκοῦν*, *ἄρα* and *ἆρα*, see § 57, 3, pp. 510, 512.

2. Many forms, as is well known, of the same spelling but differing in meaning, are distinguished from each other by the accents; as, *εἰμί sum* and *εἶμι eo* (*μύριοι ten thousand* and *μυρίοι innumerable*, Bttm. I. 278). The accented Codd. and even the editors of the N. T. sometimes waver between these two modes of accentuation. Thus for *μένει* 1 Cor. iii. 14, Chrysost., Theod., Vulg., etc., read *μενεῖ* (Fut.), which Knapp and Lchm. have admitted into the text, cf. v. 13; Heb. i. 11. In Heb. iii. 16, there is more authority for *τίνες* than *τινές*, and accordingly recent critics have almost unanimously preferred the former. For *ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι* 1 Cor. xv. 8, some Codd. have *ὡσπερεί τῳ* i.e. *τινι ἐκτρώματι*, which Knapp has unnecessarily admitted into the text, (it is clearly the correction of persons who took offence at the use of the article here, and besides, has but little authority in its favor); 66
so in 1 Thess. iv. 6 *ἔν τῳ πράγματι*, just as unnecessary. In 1 Cor. x. 19, many recent editors write *ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτον τί ἐστιν, ἢ ὅτι εἴδωλον τί ἐστιν* (Knapp and Mey.), because there is an emphasis on *τι* (antithetic to *οὐδέν*), and the other accentuation *εἰδωλόθυτόν τι ἔστιν* (Lchm.) produces ambiguity, since this might signify: *that there is anything offered to idols.* Yet even supposing the 51
former interpretation unquestionable, it is not necessary to reject 6th ed.
the usual accentuation, in so far as it gives the sense: that an offering to idols *is* something (not only *appears to be*, but *is* in reality). Critics still contend about the accentuation of John vii. 34, 36, *ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν* or *ὅπου εἶμι ἐγώ*, etc. (as several Fathers and versions read); and in Acts xix. 38 almost all recent editors have accented *ἀγόραιοι* (adj. signifying *judicial*) instead of *ἀγοραῖοι*. With regard to the first of these passages, John's use of language (xii. 26; xiv. 3; xvii. 24) gives 53
the preference to *εἰμί* (see Lücke on the passage, after Knapp, 7th ed.
comm. isagog. p. 32 sq.); but in the second, the acute would probably be correct, if we listen to Suidas, and with Kulencamp read in Ammon. p. 4: *ἀγόραιος μὲν γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἡμέρα, ἀγοραῖος δὲ ὁ Ἑρμῆς ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς*; cf. Lob. paralip. p. 340.

In the same way we must decide on Rom. i. 30, where some taking the word as active accent it *θεοστύγεις*, because *θεοστυγεῖς*

must mean *Deo exosi;* but the analogy of adjectives like μητρό-κτονος and μητροκτόνος (Bttm. II. 482) proves nothing respecting adjectives in ης. Besides, Suidas says expressly that θεοστυγεῖς means both οἱ ὑπὸ θεοῦ μισούμενοι and οἱ θεὸν μισοῦντες; (though he distinguishes θεομισής from θεομίσης in signification). The form θεοστυγεῖς, which alone is according to analogy, (compound adjectives in ης being oxytones,) is consequently the only correct form. As to the active sense of the word, however, Suidas does not appear to have quoted it as Greek usage, but only to have adopted it in the preceding passage of Paul. At least, this meaning of the word cannot be positively established from any Greek author; see Fr. Rom. I. 84 sqq. To be sure, the word occurs but a few times in all. On the other hand, there is good ground for the distinction between τροχός (*wheel*), which the text and the accented Codd. have in James iii. 6, and τρόχος (*course*), as according to Grotius, Hottinger, Schulthess, etc., it should be read (see Schäf. Soph. II. 307). The figure τροχὸς γενέσεως (joined to φλογίζουσα) is neither incorrect, nor in James particularly strange; accordingly, no alteration of the accent is required.

In regard to other passages where alterations of accent have been pro-
67 posed, as 1 Cor. xiv. 7 (ὁμῶς for ὅμως), Col. i. 15 (πρωτοτόκος for πρωτότοκος, see Mey.), or even James i. 17, πατὴρ τῶν φωτῶν for φώτων, these proposals have originated partly in doctrinal prejudices, partly in ignorance of the language. The last is positively absurd.

3. It is still an unsettled question whether in prose (for to poetry peculiar considerations apply, cf. e.g. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 476) the enclitic forms of the pronoun, where no emphasis is intended, should be joined to a preposition: whether, for instance, we should
52 write παρά σου, ἔν μοι, εἴς με, and not παρὰ σοῦ, ἐν ἐμοί, etc. In
6th ed. the editions of the N. T., even in Lchm.'s (and elsewhere also in Greek books), we constantly find πρός με, πρός σε, but ἐν σοί, ἐν ἐμοί, ἐπὶ σέ, εἰς ἐμέ, ἐπ' ἐμέ, etc.; and only in connection with those enclitic forms in a few passages, Luke i. 43; Acts xxii. 8, 13; xxiii. 22; xxiv. 19; cf. Bornem. on the last passage, (mostly at
54 the end of a sentence) from Cod. B and some others the orthotoned
7th ed. pronouns are noted as various readings. Partly on the authority of ancient grammarians, and partly for the reason laid down by Hm. emend. gr. gr. I. 75 sq. that in such combinations the pronoun has the force of a noun, one must be disposed to decide generally for the orthotoned form; (only πρός με is defended by a portion of the grammarians, and occurs frequently in Codd.) see also Bttm.

I. 285 f.; Jacobs, Anthol. Pal. I. praef. p. 32; Mtth. Eurip. Orest. 384, Sprachl. I. 110; Krü. 76; also Ellendt, Arrian. I. 199. Yet Reisig, conject. in Aristoph. p. 56, and Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 163, decide otherwise; and it must be confessed that good MSS. of Greek authors (even besides the case of *πρός με*) often have the enclitic forms. Where the pronoun is emphatic, the enclitic forms of course do not occur; accordingly Knapp and Schulz properly give Jno. xxi. 22, *τί πρὸς σέ*.

In editions of the N. T. text, the enclitic forms are in general employed agreeably to the established rules of grammarians; hence even Fr., notwithstanding Hermann's authority (emend. rat. I. 71, 73), still writes *ὁ παῖς μου* (Matt. viii. 6), *ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες* (Jno. vi. 64), *ὑπό τινων* (Luke ix. 7), and not *παῖς μοῦ*, *ἐξ ὑμῶν τινές*, *ὑπὸ τινῶν*. Lchm.[1] began to accent the pronoun in the last two instances, and also to write *ποῦ ἔστιν*, Matt. ii. 2; *μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστίν*, Mark ii. 19; but *παῖς μου* he left unchanged. He has been followed by Tdf. See, however, the judicious decision of Bttm. I. 65 f.

§ 7. PUNCTUATION.[2] 68

1. In all editions of the N. T. down to that of Griesbach inclusive, the punctuation was not only deficient in consistency, but also suffered from the mistake that in order to facilitate the understanding of the text editors punctuated too much, especially with commas. In this way, too, they forestalled the reader and imparted to the text their own exegetical views; cf. also Bttm. I. 68; Schleiermacher, Hermeneut. S. 76.

The first person who directed keener attention to punctuation, 53
and attempted to reduce it to fixed principles, was Knapp. He 6th ed.
has been followed, and with additional restrictions, by Schulz, Lchm., and Tdf. (the last adhering mostly to Lchm.).[3] None of them, however, gave a general exposition of his principles.[4] 55

Punctuation was originally contrived as an aid in reading, espe- 7th ed.
cially in reading aloud, by marking the various resting-places for

[1] Yet he (Lchm.) has printed in Acts xxvii. 44, *ἐπί τινων*; Jno. xx. 23, *ἐάν τινων*.

[2] Cf. in particular *Poppo*, in the Allg. Lit. Zeit. 1826. 1 B. S. 506 ff.; *Mtth.* I. 172 ff.; [*Lipsius*, as above, S. 81 ff.].

[3] Among the editors of Greek authors *I. Bekker* has begun to punctuate with greater moderation and consistency, and *W. Dindorf* still more sparingly. Both, however, seem to have carried the exclusion of the comma too far.

[4] *Rinck* has proposed (Stud. u. Krit. 1842. S. 554 f.) with regard to punctuation to return to the principles of the ancient Greek grammarians (*Villoison*, Anecd. II. 138 sqq.). This, however, would be hardly practicable.

the voice. At present, however, independently of the circumstance that punctuation is indispensable in any extended system of vocal signs, its main object is to enable the reader in the act of reading to understand correctly, so far as this depends on perceiving the connection of the words (Bttm. as above). Punctuation therefore must be regulated by the logical, or rather — since the thought is clothed in language — by the grammatical and rhetorical, relations of the words to each other. Hence it is too much to expect that the exegetical views of an editor should *in no degree whatever* be suggested by his punctuation, as he has to employ not merely commas, but colons and points of interrogation.

As to the proper use of the colon and period in the text of the N. T. there can be no reasonable doubt; for, the omission of the colon before the direct words of a speaker (Lchm. Tdf.) and the substitution of a capital letter, is an innovation for which there appears to be no sufficient ground. On the other hand, the propriety of inserting or not inserting a comma is more uncertain.
69 Thus much, however, is clear, that only a grammatically complete proposition[1] having a close connection with another proposition should be separated from it by a comma; and that for this special purpose the comma was devised. But a grammatically complete proposition comprehends not only a subject, a predicate, and a copula, — three elements that may be either expressed or understood, — but all qualifying words also which are introduced to define these main elements more precisely, and without which the
54 proposition would convey but an imperfect sense. Hence it was a
6th ed. mistake in Griesbach e.g. to separate the subject from the verb by a comma whenever it was accompanied by a participle or consisted
56 of a participle with adjuncts (Mark vii. 8; x. 49; Rom. viii. 5;
7th ed. 1 Jno. ii. 4; iii. 15). It is a mistake to divide 1 Thess. iv. 9 *περὶ δὲ τῆς φιλαδελφίας, οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφειν ὑμῖν*, Matt. vi. 16 *μὴ γίνεσθε, ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταί* (for *μὴ γίν.* conveys by itself no idea), v. 32 *ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* (the last words contain the most essential part of the statement), xxii. 3 *καὶ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ, καλέσαι τοὺς κεκλημένους*

[1] A grammatical proposition usually coincides with a logical, but not always. In Luke xii. 17, for instance, and in John vi. 29 (see above) we find, logically, two propositions which, however, as the second is through the relative included in the first, form grammatically but one. The same remark applies to every condensed statement in which *two* clauses are contracted into *one*. Also in 1 Tim. vi. 3, *εἴ τις ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖ καὶ μὴ προσέρχεται ὑγιαίνουσι λόγοις*, we have, logically considered, two propositions; but grammatically, they appear in this construction as only one (see above, near the close).

etc., 1 Thess. iii. 9 *τίνα γὰρ εὐχαριστίαν δυνάμεθα τῷ θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι περὶ ὑμῶν, ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ χαρᾷ* etc., 1 Cor. vii. 1 *καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ, γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι*, Acts v. 2 *καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, συνειδυίης καὶ τῆς γυναικός*. But the notion of a complete proposition is still more comprehensive. Even a relative clause is to be considered as a part of the preceding proposition when the relative (pronoun or adverb) includes also the demonstrative, as Jno. vi. 29 *ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος*, Matt. xxiv. 44 *ᾗ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρᾳ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. ἔρχεται*, Luke xii. 17 *ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς μου*; or when there is an attraction of the relative, as Luke ii. 20 *ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἤκουσαν* (cf. Schäf. Demosth. II. 657); or when the relative clause is so necessary a complement to a foregoing word that both must be taken together to complete the sense, as Luke xii. 8 *πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ*, Matt. xiii. 44 *πάντα ὅσα ἔχει*; or when the preposition is not repeated before the relative, as Acts xiii. 39 *ἀπὸ πάντων ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε* etc., Luke i. 25.[1] So where the subject, predicate, or copula of a clause consists of several words connected by *καί* (or *οὐδέ*), all these words must be 70
regarded grammatically as a compound whole, though logically they may form several clauses; as, Mark xiv. 22 *λαβὼν ὁ Ἰ. ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασε καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς*, Jno. vi. 24 *Ἰ. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*, Matt. xiii. 6 *ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος ἐκαυματίσθη καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ῥίζαν ἐξηράνθη* (so correctly Lchm.), 1 Tim. vi. 3; Matt. vi. 26. (Otherwise in Mark xiv. 27 *πατάξω τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ διασκορπισθήσεται τὰ πρόβατα*, Matt. vii. 7 *αἰτεῖτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν*. The comma is here required, because two complete propositions are connected by *καί*. It is required also when two propositions are separated by *ἤ*.)

Further, the comma is to be omitted between such clauses as Luke xxiv. 18 *σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἰερουσ. καὶ οὐκ ἔγνως* etc., since they both belong together and must be read without a pause, for only in their connection do they convey the proper sense. Also Mark xv. 25 *ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν*, and Matt. viii. 8 *οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς*, must be written without punctuation. Finally, before *ἀλλά* the comma can be properly omitted if the following clause is incomplete, and has, as 55
it were, essential roots in the preceding; as, Rom. viii. 9 *ὑμεῖς δὲ* 6th ed.
οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι, and 4 *τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περι-* 57
πατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα (where Fr. retains the comma). 7th ed.

[1] To omit the comma before every relative clause (as e.g. *Bekker* does in his edition of Plato), seems to me to be going too far.

2. On the other hand, we must not include too much in a grammatically complete proposition, and so omit commas where they are necessary. Hence we remark:

a. The Vocative is never a constituent part of the proposition with which it stands connected, but is to be regarded as its prelude, particularly when the proposition is in the first or third person. Hence we punctuate in Jno. ix. 2 *ῥαββί, τίς ἥμαρτεν*, Mark xiv. 36 *ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ, πάντα δυνατά σοι*, 2 Pet. iii. 1; Luke xv. 18; xviii. 11, etc.

b. A comma is properly put after a word which is the subject of a clause immediately following, beginning with a conjunction, and also of the principal clause; as, Jno. vii. 31 *ὁ Χριστός, ὅταν ἔλθῃ, ... ποιήσει.* Lchm. otherwise.

c. If a grammatically complete clause be followed by a supplementary statement which might properly form a clause of itself, they must be separated by a comma; as, Rom. xii. 1 *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν . . . . . τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν* (i.e. *ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ λογ. λ.*), 1 Tim. ii. 6 *ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις.* So also in
71 the case of participles, etc.; as, Col. ii. 2 *ἵνα παρακ. αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ*, Jno. ix. 13 *ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους, τόν ποτε τυφλόν*, Rom. viii. 4 *ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν* etc., verse 20; Eph. i. 12.

d. When a single (logical) proposition contains a twofold construction (e.g. an anacoluthon), it must be written with a comma and read with a pause between the two parts; as, Jno. xv. 2 *πᾶν κλῆμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μὴ φέρον καρπόν, αἴρει αὐτό.* By the addition of *αὐτό* the words *πᾶν κλῆμα . . . . . καρπ.* become a *casus pendens* which is only the prelude to the proposition, and hence no one reads on without a pause. Rev. iii. 12 *ὁ νικῶν, ποιήσω αὐτὸν στύλον* etc.; Heb. ix. 23 *ἀνάγκη τὰ μὲν ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, τούτοις καθαρίζεσθαι.* It is quite obvious that inserted complete clauses must be separated from the principal clause by commas, Luke ix. 28; Acts v. 7, and elsewhere.

e. If a sentence contains *ἀσυνδέτως* (without *καί*) several words following one another in the same construction, or simply enumerated in succession, they must be separated from each other by commas; as, 1 Pet. v. 10 *αὐτὸς καταρτίσει, στηρίξει, σθενώσει, θεμελιώσει*; Luke xiii. 14 *ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ἀγανακτῶν ὅτι . . . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἔλεγε.*

If the use of the comma in all the cases specified be well founded, a subordinate point, a half comma, would be desirable, to separate to the eye those words which in a continuous proposition, though they do not form, so to speak, a grammatical group, the reader might easily construe together. Thus, for instance, every one in reading Luke xvi. 10 ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστι will be apt to go wrong, as καί excites the expectation of a second expression co-ordinate with πιστὸς ἐν ἐλ. The same holds true of the following passages: Rom. iv. 14 εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, Jas. v. 12 ἤτω δὲ ὑμῶν τὸ ναὶ ναὶ καὶ τὸ οὒ οὔ, 1 Cor. xv. 47 ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός, Heb. v. 12 ὀφείλοντες εἶναι διδάσκαλοι διὰ τὸν χρόνον πάλιν χρείαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, Jno. v. 5 ἦν τις ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖ τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ, Rom. iii. 9 τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως (οὐ, πάντως). A half comma would at once remove all ambiguity. As, however, no such point exists, we might employ an ordinary comma, just as it is used in writing and print to distinguish ὅ,τι from ὅτι. Modern editors, however, do not punctuate at all in these passages, and this is perhaps most advisable. 58 7th ed. 56 6th ed.

3. It is on many accounts desirable that an editor's exposition of a passage should not be introduced into the text by means of punctuation. This is easily avoided where punctuation is unnecessary, as for instance in Rom. i. 17; vii. 21; Matt. xi. 11. But there are passages where punctuation — a period, a colon, a comma, or even a mark of interrogation — is indispensable, and yet cannot be employed without thereby adopting some distinct exposition of the text. In Jno. vii. 21 sq., for instance, every editor must determine whether to prefer ἓν ἔργον ἐποίησα καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε. διὰ τοῦτο Μωσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν περιτομήν etc., with Chrysost., Cyril, Euthym. Zigab., etc., or ἓν ἔργον ..... θαυμάζετε διὰ τοῦτο. Μωσῆς etc., with Theophyl. and nearly all modern editors and expositors. The former punctuation may still be defended, not indeed on the ground that John (as Schulz has shown) usually begins but never ends a clause with διὰ τοῦτο, but if the connection is understood thus: *I have done one work, and ye are all surprised; therefore* (be it known to you) *Moses gave you*, etc.; i.e. I will remove your surprise. Ye yourselves, according to the law of Moses, perform circumcision on the Sabbath. If, now, that ceremony, extending to but one part of the body, is not a desecration of the Sabbath, then the healing, affecting as it does the entire man, will certainly be allowable also. I acknowledge, however, that the usual punctuation produces a far more simple explanation of the passage, as Lücke also has shown. Heb. xi. 1 may be punctuated ἔστι δὲ πίστις, ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις etc., so that the emphasis fall on 72

ἔστι, and thus the existence of faith, in the manner indicated by
59 the words in apposition, is historically proved. However, it now
7th ed. appears to me more proper to omit the comma after πίστις, so
57 that a definition of faith is given, the correctness of which is then
6th ed. illustrated by the succeeding historical examples; see Bleek on the passage. In punctuating Jno. xiv. 30 sq. expositors vary between ἐν ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔχει οὐδέν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ..... ποιῶ. ἐγείρεσθε and οὐδέν· ἀλλ' ἵνα ..... ποιῶ, ἐγείρεσθε; and in punctuating, if the text of the N. T. is to be punctuated at all, it will not be possible to evade this difference. Compare further, Rom. iii. 9; v. 16; vi. 21; viii. 33; ix. 5; xi. 31; 1 Cor. i. 13; vi. 4; xvi. 3; Acts v. 35 (see Kühnöl); Heb. iii. 2; Jas. ii. 1, 4, 18; v. 3 sq.

The same reason, viz. to avoid prejudicing the reader in advance in favor of any one interpretation, may have been the chief motive with recent editors (Tdf.) for excluding from the text altogether the parenthesis, formerly the source of so much abuse. Lchm. had still retained it. See below, § 62.

73 § 8. RARE FORMS OF THE FIRST AND SECOND DECLENSIONS.

1. Masculine proper names in ᾶς of the 1st Decl. — mostly oriental, but formed in accordance with well-known Greek analogy — end in the Gen. Sing. uniformly in ᾶ; as, Ἰωαννᾶ Luke iii. 27, Ἰωνᾶ Matt. xii. 39; Jno. i. 43, etc. Κλωπᾶ Jno. xix. 25, Στεφανᾶ 1 Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15, Σκευᾶ Acts xix. 14, Κηφᾶ 1 Cor. i. 12, Σατανᾶ Mark i. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 9, Ἐπαφρᾶ Col. i. 7.[1]

Likewise those ending in unaccented ας make the Gen. in α; as, Καϊάφα Jno. xviii. 13, Ἄννα Luke iii. 2, Ἀρέτα 2 Cor. xi. 32 (Joseph. antiqq. 17, 3, 2; 18, 5, 1), Βαρνάβα Gal. ii. 1; Col. iv. 10, Ἀγρίππα[2] Acts xxv. 23; cf. Joseph. antiqq. 16, 2, 3; 16, 6, 7; 20, 7, 1, etc. (Σίλα Joseph. vit. 17, Ματθεία Acta apocr. p. 133), Ἰούδα often.

The same form in proper names is often used by Attic authors; as, Μασκᾶ Xen. An. 1, 5, 4, Γωβρύα Xen. C. 5, 2, 14, Κομάτα Theocr. 5, 150 a., cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 156; Krü. 42; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 83; V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 566; and on Βοῤῥᾶ, Luke xiii. 29, Rev. xxi. 13, especially Bttm. I. 147, 199; Bekker, Anecd. III. 1186.

[1] So also Θωμᾶ in the Act. Thom., Λουκᾶ Euseb. H. E. 3, 24, Ἑρμᾶ Euseb. 3, 3.

[2] On the other hand, we find occasionally Ἀγρίππου in Joseph. (antt. 18, 7, 1 and 2; 18, 8, 8, etc.) and Euseb. H. E. 2, 19. Codd. of Xenoph. also vary between Γωβρύου and Γωβρύα.

On the other hand, those in *ας* pure have the usual Attic form (e.g. *Αἰνείας*) in *ου* (Lob. prolegg. pathol. p.487 sqq.) ; as, *Ἀνδρέου* Mark i. 29 ; Jno. i. 45 (Joseph. antiqq. 12, 2, 3 ; Acta apocr. p. 158, 159), *Ἡλίου* Luke i. 17 ; iv. 25, *Ἡσαΐου* Matt. iii. 3 ; xiii. 14 ; Acts 60
xxviii. 25 and elsewhere, *Ἱερεμίου* Matt. ii. 17 ; xxvii. 9, *Ζαχαρίου* 7th ed
Matt. xxiii. 35 ; Luke i. 40 and elsewhere, *Λυσανίου* Luke iii. 1, *Βαραχίου* Matt. xxiii. 35. So always in Joseph. *Ὀνίας*, *Ὀνίου* ; in other places *Τωβίου* (Geo. Syncell. chronogr. p. 164 ; but usually 58
Τωβία). See, in general, Geo. Choerobosci dictata in Theodosii 6th ed
canon. ed. Gaisford, I. p. 42.

Several names of places that might have been declined according to the 1st Decl. are indeclinable in the N. T. ; as, Κανᾶ (Dat. Jno. ii. 1, 11 ; Acc. iv. 46), Βηθσαϊδά, Βηθφαγή, Γολγοθᾶ, Ῥαμᾶ. Βηθαβαρᾶ Jno. i. 28 would not come under this head, since Origen uses it as a Neut. Plur. ; recent editors have printed *ἐν Βηθανίᾳ*. Λύδδα is unquestionably inflected as 74
feminine in Acts ix. 38 (Λύδδης), on the other hand in vs. 32 and 35 Λύδδα as Neut. Acc. has respectable Codd. in its favor ; cf. my RW. II. 30.

Words in *αρχος*[1] commonly follow in the N. T. and later Greek the first declension, and end in *αρχης* ;[2] as, *πατριάρχης* Heb. vii. 4, Plur. Acts vii. 8, 9, coll. 1 Chron. xxvii. 22, *τετράρχης* Matt. xiv. 1 ; Luke iii. 19 ; ix. 7, coll. Joseph. antiqq. 18, 7, 1, *τετράρχαι* Euseb. H. E. 1, 7, 4 ; *πολιτάρχης* Acts xvii. 6 ; *ἐθνάρχης* 2 Cor. xi. 32, coll. 1 Macc. xiv. 47, *ἐθνάρχῃ* 1 Macc. xv. 1, 2, *ἐθνάρχην* Joseph. antiqq. 17, 11, 4, *ἐθνάρχας* Euseb. Const. 1, 8 ; *ἀσιάρχης*, hence *ἀσιαρχῶν* Acts xix. 31, and *ἀσιάρχην* Euseb. H. E. 4, 15, 11 (Asiarcha, Cod. Theodos. 15, 92) ; *ἑκατοντάρχης* Acts x. 1, 22 ; xxi. 32 ; xxii. 26, coll. Joseph. b. j. 3, 6, 2, *ἑκατοντάρχῃ* Acts xxiv. 23 ; xxvii. 31 ; Matt. viii. 13 where, however, a few Codd. have *ἑκατοντάρχῳ*, just as in Joseph. b. j. 2, 4. 3, *ἑκατόνταρχον* is found besides *ἑκατοντάρχην*. On the other hand, *ἑκατόνταρχος* occurs almost without var. in the following passages : Matt. viii. 5, 8 ; Luke vii. 6 ; Acts xxii. 25 ; (the Gen. Sing. Luke vii. 2, and Plur. Acts xxiii. 23, the former with the same accent and the latter with a circumflex on the last, may be cases of *ἑκατοντάρχης* also).

[1] The MSS. even of ancient Greek authors vary, indeed, between *αρχος* and *αρχης*, but later critics, in them, give the form *αρχος* the preference ; cf. *Bornem.* Xen. conv. 1, 4 ; *Poppo*, Xen. Cyrop. 2, 1, 22, p. 109. This also corresponds best with the etymology (from *ἀρχός*). So *τόπαρχος*, Aeschyl. Choëph. 662. *Γυμνασιάρχης*, however, is undoubtedly the correct reading in Aeschin. Tim. ed. *Bremi* I. 23.

[2] That *this* was the predominant termination in the Apostolic age appears further from the circumstance that the Romans in rendering such words into Latin gave to them this or a similar form, when they might just as well have chosen the form in *archus*. Hence *Tetrarches*, Hirt. bell. Alex. c. 67 ; Liv. epitom. 94 ; Horat. serm. 1, 3, 12 ; Lucan. 7, 227 ; *Alabarches*, Cic. Attic. 2, 17 ; Juven. Satir. 1, 130 ; *Toparcha*, Spartian. in Hadrian. 13 ; *Patriarcha*, Tertull. de anim. c. 7, 55, and elsewhere. Cf. *Schäf.* Demosth. II. 151. Byzantine authors still more fully attest the predominance of this form.

Finally, for στρατοπεδάρχῃ Acts xxviii. 16 (Const. Man. 4412, etc.) the better Codd. have στρατοπεδάρχῳ. Elsewhere, besides, in the Greek Bible and in authors of the first Christian centuries we find the following vouchers
61 for the form αρχης: γενεσιάρχης Wisd. xiii. 3, κωμάρχης Esth. ii. 3, κυπριάρχης
ed. 2 Macc. xii. 2, τοπάρχης Gen. xli. 34; Dan. iii. 2, 3; vi. 7; Euseb. H. E. 1, 13, 3, θιασάρχης Lucian. peregr. 11, μεράρχης Arrian. Tact. p. 30, φαλαγγάρχης ibid. p. 30, εἰλάρχης ibid. p. 50, ἐλεφαντάρχης 2 Macc. xiv. 12; 3 Macc. v. 4, 45, ἀλαβάρχης Joseph. antiqq. 19, 5, 1, γενάρχης Lycophr. 1307;
59 Joseph. antiqq. 1, 13, 4, ταξιάρχης Arrian. Al. 2, 16, 11; Euseb. Constant.
ith ed. 4, 63 (though ibid. 4, 51 and 68 also ταξίαρχος; see Heinichen, index p. 585), ἰλάρχης Arrian. Alex. 1, 12, 11; 2, 7, 5, συριάρχης Acta apocr. p. 52, νομάρχης Papyr. Taur. p. 24, γειτονιάρχης Boisson. Anecd. V. 73. To quote from the Byzantine writers all the compounds of this kind would be endless; examples occur in almost every page. Of other compounds the form in αρχος is exclusively used in the N. T.; as, χιλίαρχος in all passages (22).
75 On the other hand see χιλιάρχης in Arrian. Al. 1, 22, 9; 7, 25, 11 (Ellendt, Arrian. II. 267), besides in Sept. Ex. xviii. 11, 25; Deut. i. 15; Num. i. 16, where we find also δεκάδαρχος (δεκαδάρχαι Arrian. Tact. p. 98). In the Byzantines κένταρχος Cedren. 1, 705, 708, νυκτέπαρχος Leo Diac. 6, 2, must be considered as isolated instances.

Dialectic inflection in the 1st Decl. occurs in Acts x. 1; xxi. 31; xxvii. 1, where we find the Ionic form σπείρης from σπεῖρα, only in the first passage with some var. in the Codd. (cf. Arrian. acies contra Alanos, pp. 99, 100, 102); and in good Codd. we find μαχαίρης Rev. xiii. 14; Heb. xi. 34, 37, and μαχαίρῃ Rev. xiii. 10; Luke xxii. 49; Acts xii. 2 (cf. Ex. xv. 9) [likewise πρώρης Acts xxvii. 30 in A and Sin., which Lchm. has adopted]; cf. also Σαπφείρῃ Acts v. 1 (Lchm. Σαπφειρᾷ), and συνειδυίης v. 2, according to good Codd. See Mtth. I. 183.

2. In the Second Declension the following forms occur:

a. Ἀπολλῶ in Acc. Sing. for Ἀπολλῶν from Ἀπολλῶς (Acts xviii. 24) Acts xix. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 6 (the Gen. regularly Ἀπολλῶ 1 Cor. iii. 4; xvi. 12); cf. Bttm. I. 155, 199. Good Codd. (Bttm. I. 155; Krü. 45) have Acts xxi. 1 τὴν Κῶ (1 Macc. xv. 23; Joseph. antiqq. 14, 7, 2), where the usual form τὴν Κῶν has but little authority. However, together with Κῶς, Κῶ is found as indeclinable in Strabo 10, 489; cf. further, Duker, Thuc. 8, 41.

b. Νοΐ, as Dat. (after the 3d Decl.) of νοῦς, 1 Cor. i. 10; xiv. 15; Rom. vii. 25; and νοός as Gen. for νοῦ, 1 Cor. xiv. 19. Greek authors, instead of νοΐ, usually employ νόῳ, or contr. νῷ. Νοΐ occurs besides only in Simplic. ad Aristot. phys. 31, 25; Philo I. 63 (Bekker, Anecd. III. p. 1196), the Byzantines (e.g. Malalas, see index in Bonn ed. Theophan. 28), and the Fathers; see Lob. Phryn. 453; Boissonade, Marin. p. 93 sq. Likewise πλοός Acts

xxvii. 9, as Gen. (for πλοῦ), as in Arrian. peripl. p. 176; Malalas, 5, p. 94; Cinnam. p. 86; cf. Lob. as above.

c. The Vocative θεέ Matt. xxvii. 46 without var. (Judg. xxi. 3; Wisd. ix. 1; Acta Thom. 25, 45, 57; Τιμόθεε 1 Tim. i. 18; vi. 20), of which scarcely an instance is to be found in Greek authors; cf. Bttm. I. 151. Even the Sept. has usually Voc. θεός.

d. We find the Plur. of ὀστέον without contraction ὀστέα Luke xxiv. 39, and ὀστέων Matt. xxiii. 27; Heb. xi. 22, and elsewhere. The latter, however, occurs not very unfrequently in Greek prose: Lucian. necyom. 15; Plat. Locr. 102 d. (cf. besides, Eurip. Orest. 404; Troad. 1177). Ὀστέα is more rare; cf. Plat. Locr. 100 b.; Aristot. anim. 3, 7; Menand. ed. Meineke, p. 196. 62 7th ed.

As Metaplasms we must notice:

1. Ὁ δεσμός Plur. τὰ δεσμά Luke viii. 29; Acts xvi. 26; xx. 23, only once οἱ δεσμοί Phil. i. 13, everywhere without var. In Greek authors, too, δεσμοί is more rare than δεσμά Thom. Mag. p. 204 (Bttm. I. 210; cf. Kühnöl, ad Act. p. 558). 60 6th ed. 76

2. From σάββατον we find only Gen. Sing. and Plur. and Dat. Sing.,[1] but the Dat. Plur. σάββασι (which occurs also in Meleag. 83, 4) comes, according to Passow, from a Sing. σάββατ, Gen. σάββατος.

3. The Masc. σῖτος has in the Plur. (besides σῖτοι) σῖτα Acts vii. 12 var., as often in Greek writers. (A Sing. σῖτον was never in use; see Schäf. Soph. Elect. 1366.) The best Codd., however, [Sin. also] give in Acts vii. 12 σιτία, which has now been received into the text.

In regard to gender be it observed:

1. λιμός in Luke xv. 14; Acts xi. 28, according to some good Codd. (also according to a very few authorities in Luke iv. 25), is construed as Fem., agreeably to the Doric dialect (Lob. 188); cf. Malalas 3, p. 60. See Bornem. ad Acta, as above.

2. βάτος is Masc. in Mark xii. 26 (though not without var.), and Fem. in Luke xx. 37; Acts vii. 35, (Fr. Mr. p. 532). Compare in general, Lob. paralip. 174 sq. (ἡ πηλός Const. Man. 2239, 2764, etc.).

3. Instead of ὁ νῶτος, the later form, some Codd. in Rom. xi. 10 have τὸ νῶτον, the form used by the earlier writers; see Fr. on the passage.

[1] We find in the Sept. the Dat. Plur. also of this form, σαββάτοις 1 Chron. xxiii. 31; 2 Chron. ii. 4; viii. 13; Ezek. xlvi. 3, as well as in Joseph. antt. 16, 6, 4, together with σάββασι. In the N. T. it occasionally appears among the var. as in Matt. xii. 1, 12, according to good Codd.

§ 9. RARE FORMS OF THE THIRD DECLENSION.

Among these belong, 1. In the Singular:

a. The Genitive *ἡμίσους* Mark vi. 23, from the Neut. *ἥμισυ* (used as a substantive), instead of the usual form *ἡμίσεος*; cf. Dio Chr. 7, 99; Schwartz, comment. p. 652; Bttm. I. 191.

b. The Dative *γήρει* (Ionic), for *γήρεϊ* Luke i. 36 (as *οὔδει* from *οὖδος* in Homer), for which the text. recept. has *γήρᾳ*; cf. Ps. xci. 15; Sir. viii. 6; Theophan. p. 36, and the Fathers, e.g. Theodoret. in Ps. cxix. (ed. Hal. I. 1393); Fabric. Pseudepigr. II. 630, 747; Boissonade, Anecd. III. 19.

c. The Accusative *ὑγιῆ* Jno. v. 11, 15; Tit. ii. 8 (Lev. xiii. 15.). The Attic authors use another contraction, *ὑγιᾶ*, but the former occurs also in Plat. Phaed. 89 d., and similar forms in other passages (Mtth. I. 233).

77 d. *Ἀρτέμων*, Acts xxvii. 40, has, according to A [Sin.] and several other Codd., *ἀρτέμωνα*, which Lchm. has adopted (cf. *γλήχωνι*
63 Homer. Cerer. 209), as also Lob. Soph. Ai. p. 171, in preference
7th ed. to the usual form *ἀρτέμονα*: appellativi declinatio sine dubio eadem quae proprii (Anacr. fragm. 27, and Fischer's note).

2. In the Plural:

a. The Accusative in *εἷς* (instead of *έας*) from Nom. Sing. in *ευς*, e.g. *γονεῖς*, Matt. x. 21; Luke ii. 27; *γραμματεῖς*, Matt. xxiii. 34, etc. So also in Attic writers; e.g. Xen. (see Poppo, Cyrop. p. 32 sq.; Weber, Dem. p. 492 and 513), though the Atticists reject it; see Mtth. I. 235.

61 b. The Dative of the Numeral *δυσίν* (Thom. M. 253), Matt.
8th ed. xxii. 40; Luke xvi. 13; Acts xii. 6, follows wholly the analogy of the 3d Decl. It occurs also in Thuc. 8, 101 (*δυσὶν ἡμέραις*), in Plutarch, Aristotle, Hippocrates, and others, instead of the usual *δυοῖν*; see Lob. 210 sq.; Bttm. I. 276. In the Genitive, *δύο* is always indeclinable; Matt. xx. 24; xxi. 31; Jno. i. 41; 1 Tim. v. 19, etc., as sometimes in Greek authors, e.g. Lucian. dial. mort. 4, 1; Aesop. 145, 1. (Mtth. I. 337).

c. As uncontracted forms appear — contrary to the general usage — *ὀρέων* Rev. vi. 15 (Ezek. xi. 10; 1 Kings xx. 28; Isa. xiii. 4, etc.), and *χειλέων* Heb. xiii. 15 (Prov. xii. 14; xxxi. 31; Wisd. i. 6; Ecclus. xxii. 27, etc.), the other cases being declined regularly. Such genitives, however, are not unfrequent even in Greek prose; cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 145; Poppo, Xen. C. p. 213;

Jacobs, Achill. Tat. 2, 1. As to the poets, see Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. pp. x. xii.

d. The contraction of the Neut. *ἡμίση* Luke xix. 8 (as a substantive, cf. Theophr. ch. 11), to which applies what we have said above of *ἡμίσους*. The usual form is *ἡμίσεα* (which is the reading here in some Codd.; Tdf., however, has *ἡμίσεια* from B L [Sin.], cf. Bttm. I. 248); cf. Fischer, prol. p. 667; Bttm. I. 191.

e. The contracted Gen. *πηχῶν* Jno. xxi. 8; Rev. xxi. 17, instead of *πηχέων* (as the Cod. Al. has in the first passage [and Cod. Sin. in the last]). *Πηχῶν* is a later form (see Lob. p. 246), yet it occurs in Xen. An. 4, 7, 16, and frequently in Plutarch.

From *κλείς* we have the more common form *κλεῖδα* Luke xi. 52 and in a few Codd. Rev. iii. 7; xx. 1 (frequently in Sept. Judg. iii. 25; Isa. xxii. 22) for (the Attic) *κλεῖν* (Thom. M. p. 536; Lob. 460). Yet in the Plur. *κλεῖδας*, Matt. xvi. 19, has more authority than *κλεῖς*, which, on the other hand, in Rev. i. 18 is the best attested reading. Just so *ἔριδες* 1 Cor. i. 11 and *ἔρεις* (as Nom. and Acc.) 2 Cor. xii. 20, occur; in Gal. v. 20, however, the correct reading is probably *ἔρις*. *Κρέας* has the regular Plur. contraction (Bttm. I. 196), *κρέα*, Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. viii. 13 (Exod. xvi. 8, 12), as in Xen. C. 1, 3, 6; 2, 2, 2. On the other hand, *κέρας* has *κέρατα* Rev. v. 6; xiii. 1, 11; xvii. 12 (Amos iii. 14), *κεράτων* Rev. ix. 13; xiii. 1 (1 Kings i. 50; ii. 29), and never the contracted *κέρα*, *κερῶν* (Bttm. I. as above; Bekker, Anecd. III. p. 1001). Lastly, *τέρας* has always *τέρατα* Matt. xxiv. 24; Acts ii. 43; v. 12; Jno. iv. 48; *τεράτων*, Rom. xv. 19, instead of *τέρα*, *τερῶν*, the forms which pass for Attic; see Moeris, p. 339; Bttm. as above. 78

Note 1. In 1 Thess. v. 3 (Isa. xxxvii. 3) we find *ὠδίν* for *ὠδίς*, Nom. Sing. of *ὠδῖνες*, like *δελφίν* in later writers not unfrequent, see Bttm. I. 162 (cf. also *κλειδίν* Const. Porph. 14, 208). 64 7th ed.

Note 2. In several passages in good MSS. *πλοῦτος*, contrary to general usage, is used as Neuter, Eph. ii. 7; iii. 8, 16; Phil. iv. 19; Col. ii. 2 (Acta apocr. p. 76), a peculiarity probably originating in the language of the people, as the modern Greeks use indiscriminately both *τὸ πλοῦτος* and *ὁ πλοῦτος*, see Coray, Plutarch. vit. II. p. 58; Isocr. II. 103, 106. In the same way we find *τὸ ζῆλος* 2 Cor. ix. 2 in Codd. B [and Sin.]; Phil. iii. 6 in A B [Sin.] (Clem. ep. p. 17 Ittig.) and perhaps *τὸ ἦχος* Luke xxi. 25, (if the Gen. be accented *ἤχους*, as it is by Lchm.), according to good Codd., as Malal. p. 121, 436. Compare in later writers, *τὸ κλάδος* Theophan. contin. ed. Bekker, p. 222; see, in general, Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 106. On the other hand, we find in later writers *ὁ δεῖπνος* Luke xiv. 16 B D; see Hase, ad Leon. Diac. p. 239; Schäf. ind. Aesop. pp. 128, 163; Boisson. Herod. Epim. p. 22, and Anecd. I. 51; and *ὁ τεῖχος* Ducas p. 266 Bonn.; Acta apocr. p. 84. The heteroclite *σκότος* (Poppo, Thuc. I. 225) 62 6th ed.

is found only once as Masc. (Heb. xii. 18 *σκότῳ*, but not certain), else always Neut. (*σκότους*, *σκότει*) without a single var. noted. As to *ἔλεος*, which the Sept. sometimes use as Masc. (so too Philo I. 284), in N. T. MSS. the Neut. predominates (var. only Matt. ix. 13; xii. 7; xxiii. 23; Tit. iii. 5; Heb. iv. 16). *Θάμβος* has, Acts iii. 10, Gen. *θάμβου* in C.

Note 3. The MSS. have several instances of *ν* subjoined to the Acc. Sing. in *α* or *ῆ* (*ἐλπίδαν*, *συγγενῆν*, cf. Sturz, dial. alex. p. 127; Lob. paralip. p. 142), as Matt. ii. 10 *ἀστέραν*, Codd. [Sin.* and] Ephr. Jno. xx. 25, *χεῖραν* Cod. Alex., and in same Cod. Rev. xii. 13 *ἄρσεναν*, xiii. 14 *εἰκόναν*, xxii. 2 *μῆναν*, Acts xiv. 12 *Δίαν* according to several Codd., and Rom. xvi. 11 *συγγενῆν*, Heb. vi. 19 *ἀσφαλῆν* (this also in Codd. Ephr. and Cantab.); Rev. i. 13 *ποδήρην*. Likewise in the Byzantine writers we find similar forms (see Index to Leo Grammat. p. 532; Boisson. anecd. V. 102), as also in the Apocr. (Tdf. de evang. apocr. p. 137), and in Rev. Lchm. has received into the text the forms quoted above. This subjoined *ν* is probably not to be considered, with Ross, as an *original* termination (transmitted in the popular speech), but as an arbitrary extension of the *ν* usual in the Acc. of many sorts of words (Mtth. 208), Lob. paralip. as above. In adjectives of two terminations in *ης*, this form is said to be Aeolic, Mtth. 289. Moreover, see also Bornem. on Acts as above.

79 § 10. FOREIGN WORDS AND WORDS WHICH ARE INDECLINABLE.

1. In the case of certain Hellenized Oriental names the Sept. and the N. T. writers have introduced a simple mode of inflection,
65 according to which the Gen., Dat., and Voc. coincide for the most
7th ed. part in one and the same form, and the Acc. is designated by *ν*. To this class of nouns belong the following: *Ἰησοῦς*, Gen. *Ἰησοῦ* Matt. xxvi. 69, Dat. *Ἰησοῦ* Matt. xxvi. 17,[1] Voc. *Ἰησοῦ* Mark i. 24, Acc. *Ἰησοῦν* Matt. xxvi. 4; Acts xx. 21. *Λευΐ* or *Λευΐς* (Luke v. 29), Acc. *Λευΐν* Mark ii. 14. *Ἰωσῆς* Gen. *Ἰωσῆ* Matt. xxvii. 56; Luke iii. 29, etc. (but B D and L have everywhere in Mark *Ἰωσῆτος*), Bttm. I. 199. Like *Ἰησοῦς* is declined the Egyptian name *Θαμοῦς* (Plat. Phaed. 274 d.) Mtth. I. 198. The word *Μωσῆς* (*Μωϋσῆς*) is declined in two ways. The Gen. (also in the
63 Greek Fathers and Byzant. authors) is invariably *Μωσέως* (cf.
6th ed. Diod. S. Ecl. 34, p. 194, Lips.). As to the Dat., however, even good Codd. vary between *Μωσεῖ* (also in Euseb. and Theophan.) and *Μωσῇ*, cf. Matt. xvii. 4; Mark ix. 5; Luke ix. 33; Jno. v. 46; ix. 29; Acts vii. 44; Rom. ix. 15; 2 Tim. iii. 8. The Acc. is

[1] Along with these forms, the Codd. of the Sept. often have for the Dat. (Deut. iii. 21, 28; xxxi. 23) and even for the Gen. (Exod. xvii. 14) the form *Ἰησοῖ*.

Μωσῆν, Acts vi. 11; vii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 2; Heb. iii. 3 (Diod. S. 1, 94); only Luke xvi. 29 has without var. *Μωσέα* (as Euseb. H. E. 1, 3, and often in Clem. Alex., Geo. Syncell., Glycas, etc.). All these forms, with the exception of *Μωσέως*, may be derived unhesitatingly from Nom. *Μωσῆς* (see the analogies Bttm. I. 198, 210, 221). For *Μωσέως*, a Nom. *Μωσεύς* has been demanded; but it does not occur, and after all it is not necessary, since *Ἄρης* also has sometimes Gen. *Ἄρεως* (Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 224). Outside of the N. T. the Gen. *Μωσῆ* is also found in LXX. and Geo. Phrantz., and *Μωσοῦ* in Bauer, glossar. Theodoret. p. 269. *Μωσῆ* occurs as Voc. in Exod. iii. 4. *Μανασσῆ* in Matt. i. 10 has Acc. *Μανασσῆ*, according to others *Μανασσῆν*.

The name of Solomon in text. rec. is declined Σολομῶντα Matt. i. 6, Σολομῶντος Matt. xii. 42; Luke xi. 31; Jno. x. 23; Acts iii. 11; v. 12 (like Ξενοφῶν, Ξενοφῶντος). But the better MSS. have Σολομῶνος, Σολομῶνα, see Wetsten. I. 228; and this, being according to analogy and also the received form in Joseph. ed. Havercamp, deserves probably to be admitted into the text, since the termination *ῶν, ῶντος* implies derivation from a participle (Bttm. I. 169; Lob. paralip. 347). But then we must write in the Nom. (not Σολομῶν, as Lchm. even has printed, but) Σολομών 80 agreeably to the better authorities,[1] like Βαβυλών, etc. (cf. also Pappelb. Cod. Diez. p. 9). Ποσειδῶν (Ποσειδῶνος), being contracted from Ποσειδάων, is not analogous. In the Sept. Σολομών is indeclinable; see 1 Kings iv. 7, 29; v. 12, 15, 16; vi. 18, and elsewhere.

2. Many Hebrew proper names which might have been inflected according to the 3d Decl. are used in the Sept. and in the N. T. as indeclinable; e.g. *Ἀαρών* Gen., Heb. vii. 11; ix. 4; Dat., Exod. 66 vii. 9; Acts vii. 40; Acc., Exod. vii. 8; cf. in particular Matt. i. 7th ed. and Luke iii. 23 sqq.; besides *Συμεών* Luke iii. 30, *Σαλμών* Luke iii. 32, *Κεδρών* Jno. xviii. 1 var. So *Ἰεριχῶ*, Gen. Deut. xxxii. 49; Matt. xx. 29; Heb. xi. 30; Acc., Luke x. 30; xviii. 35 (Glyc. p. 304).[2] *Ἱερουσαλήμ*, for which, however, in Matt. Mark and Jno. the Grecized form *Ἱεροσόλυμα* might on the authority of MSS. be preferred, which is regularly declined as Neut., Matt. iv. 25; 64 Mark iii. 8; Luke xxiii. 7; Jno. ii. 23. It is Feminine only in 6th ed.

[1] In Glycas *Bekker* has had printed, even in the new edition, Σολομῶντος, Σολομῶντα, but for the Nom. Σολομών.

[2] Elsewhere, on the other hand, we find a twofold mode of declining the word: *a.* Gen. Ἰεριχοῦ 3 Esr. v. 44, Dat. Ἰεριχῷ Procop. de aedif. 5, 9; Theodoret. V. p. 81, Hal., or Ἰεριχοῖ Joseph. b. j. 1, 21, 4. Suid. under Ὠριγενής; and *b.* from Ἰερικοῦς (Ptol. 5, 16, 7), Gen. Ἰερικοῦντος Strabo 16, 763, Acc. Ἰερικοῦντα 16, 760, and usually in Josephus.

Matt. ii. 3 (iii. 5 ?). The Sept. has only the form Ἱερουσαλήμ; Joseph., on the contrary, Ἱεροσόλυμα. Τὸ πάσχα, Luke ii. 41; Jno. ii. 23; as in Sept.[1] So also (τὸ) σίκερα Luke i. 15, and in Sept. Lev. x. 9; Num. vi. 3; Isa. xxiv. 9, etc. (Euseb. praep. ev. 6, 10, has Gen. σίκερος).[2] The Hebrew Plural termination occurs only in Heb. ix. 5, Χερουβίμ; this word, however, as in the Sept., is construed as Neut. (Gen. iii. 24; 1 Kings viii. 7; Ezek. x. 3, etc.) like πνεύματα.

Also in Rev. i. 4 a whole phrase (the Greek equivalent for יְהוָה) is treated as indeclinable: ἀπὸ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, perhaps with design (as the name of the immutable One) like ἕν, μηθέν, etc. in Greek philosophical writings, even in Aristot. e.g. polit. 5, 3; Procl. theol. Plat. 2. ed. Hoeschel μετὰ τοῦ ἕν, χωρὶς τοῦ ἕν (Stollberg, de soloecis. N. T. p. 14 sqq.). On the other hand, in Creuzer's edition of the writings of Proclus we find invariably ἐκ τοῦ ἑνός, ἐν τῷ ἑνί. Cf. also τὸν ὁ δεῖνα, Schäf. Demosth. III. 282.

81 § 11. INFLECTION AND COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES.

1. Adjectives of three terminations, particularly those in ιος, μιος, ειος, αιος, are not unfrequently (especially in Attic authors) used as adjectives of only two terminations (Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 77, Lips.; Monk, Eurip. Hippol. p. 56, and Eurip. Alcest. 126, 67 548, 1043; Mtth. 295 ff.). In the N. T. we find Luke ii. 13 στρατιὰ 7th ed. οὐράνιος, Acts xxvi. 19, κόσμιος 1 Tim. ii. 9; also Rev. iv. 3 ἶρις (Fem.) κυκλόθεν τοῦ θρόνου ὅμοιος (the best established reading) σμαραγδίνῳ, etc.; see my exeget. Stud. I. 152. On the other hand, in 1 Tim. ii. 8 ὁσίους χεῖρας (for ὁσίας, which some Codd. in fact have), ὁσίους may possibly be construed with ἐπαίροντας, though that is not necessary (Fr. Rom. III. 16). Cf. also Tit. iii. 9 μάταιοι referring to a Fem. subst., and Jas. i. 26 μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία.

On the other hand, later Greek has used adjectives of two terminations as adjectives of three terminations; as, ἀργός Lob. p. 105,

[1] So also in the Fathers; see *Suicer*, thes. II. 607 sqq.; Epiphan. haer. II. 19 gives inflection even to the Plur. τὰ πάσχα.

[2] Most of these names are declined in Josephus, who generally, in conformity to the genius of the Greek language, gives terminations to almost all proper names (of persons), and consequently declines them; e.g. Ἄδαμος, Ἰσμαῆλος, Νῶχος, Ἴσακος, and others. The instances of undeclined foreign names, which *Georgi*, Hierocr. I. 138, produces from Plato and Pausan., are partly not to the point, and partly prove nothing against the tendency to inflection. Even Ptolem., besides the large number of declined names of places, used some as indeclinable; *Nobbe*, schedae Ptolem. I. (Lips. 1841. 8vo.) p. 23 sq

and paralip. p. 455 sqq., cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 242. Yet this occurs in a quotation from Epimenides Tit. i. 12. *Συγγενής*, *ές*, forms a special feminine *συγγενίς* (substant.) Luke i. 36, which on the authority of good Codd. Lchm. has adopted, Lob. Phryn. 451 sq. Cf. Malal. pp. 95, 96.

Αἰώνιος has in the N. T. usually but two terminations; but in 2 Thess. 65
ii. 16; Heb. ix. 12 *αἰωνίαν* occurs in the text, and in the latter passage 6th ed.
without var.; also, according to single Codd., in 2 Pet. i. 11; Acts xiii. 48; cf. Num. xxv. 13, Plat. Tim. 38 b. *Βεβαία* Rom. iv. 16, etc., which the fastidious Thom. M. 149 declares to be corrupt, is found in Isocr., Demosth. (Weber, Dem. p. 133), Xenoph., etc., cf. Duker, Thuc. 2, 43. *Ἔρημος*, which even in Attic varies (cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 262; Mtth. 306), in the N. T. always has two terminations. As to *ἀσφαλην* Heb. vi. 19, i.e. *ἀσφαλῆν* [so too Lchm. in his stereotype ed., while in his larger ed. he writes *ἀσφαλήν*] see § 9. note 3, p. 66.

The N. T. Lexicons [Grimm, however, has it correctly] give *γνήσιος* as an adjective of two terminations (Phil. iv. 3 ?) without sufficient reason, since the Fem. in the form *γνήσιος* cannot be shown to occur.

2. On the Comparison of adjectives we have only to observe,

a. The Compar. Neut. of *ταχύς* is *τάχιον* (Jno. xx. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 14; Heb. xiii. 19, 23, etc.), for which in earlier Greek *θᾶσσον*, and in Attic *θᾶττον*, was usual. *Τάχιον* occurs regularly in Diod. S., Dion. H., Plutarch and others, Lob. p. 77; Meineke, Menandr. p. 144; cf. also 1 Macc. ii. 40; Wisd. xiii. 9.

b. In 3 Jno. 4 we find a double Comparative *μειζότερος*, and in
Eph. iii. 8 a Compar. formed from the Superlative *ἐλαχιστότερος* 82
(cf. *ἐλαχιστότατος* Sext. Emp. 9, 406, and in Latin, *minimissimus*, *pessimissimus*). Such forms belong specially to the diction of poetry (Apoll. Rhod. 2, 368, *μειότερος*), or to the later language which sought thus to strengthen the Comparative that had become weak to the popular mind; cf. *κρειττότερος* Ducas 27, 29, 37, *μειζονότερος* ibid. c. 27, and Malal. 18, p. 490, *μειζότερος* Constant. Porph. III. 257, *πλειότερος* Theophan. p. 567. Yet some such instances are found even in earlier authors (see Wetst. II. 247), though, as in the case of *ἐσχατώτερος* Aristot. Metaph. 10, 4, not 68
as already existing and current, but as arbitrary formations; see 7th ed.
Bttm. I. 274 f., Lob. Phryn. p. 136. In German compare the form *mehrere* from *mehr*.

c. The Comparatives *κατώτερος* Eph. iv. 9, *ἀνώτερος* Luke xiv. 10, *ἐσώτερος* Acts xvi. 24, from the adverbs *κάτω*, *ἄνω*, *ἔσω*, are groundlessly questioned by Bttm. I. 271. They are the undoubted read-

ings in the N. T. and Sept., and not only occur frequently in later authors, as Leo Diac. 10, 1, but even in Attic, Mtth. 328.

On the form of the Comp. of other Adverbs derived from Adjectives, as περισσοτέρως 2 Cor. i. 12; Gal. i. 14; Phil. ii. 28, etc., which is not unknown to classic Greek writers, see Bttm. II. 345; Elmsley, Eurip. Herac. p. 100 Lips.

The Positive ἤρεμος 1 Tim. ii. 2 is not found in earlier Greek (Bttm. I. 271, II. 343); Lob. pathol. p. 158 has shown that it occurs in Inscript. Olbiopol. 2059, 24.

§ 12. AUGMENT AND REDUPLICATION OF REGULAR VERBS.

1. A temporal Augment instead of the syllabic occurs,

a. In the Imperfect ἤμελλε Jno. iv. 47; xi. 51; xii. 33; xviii. 32; Luke x. 1; Acts xvi. 27; xxvii. 33; Rev. x. 4, with decided preponderance of authority. On the contrary, ἔμελλε in Luke
66 ix. 31; Jno. vi. 71; Heb. xi. 8, is better attested. See in general
6th ed Böckh, Plat. Men. p. 148 sq.

b. In the Imperfect ἠδύνατο Matt. xxvi. 9; Mark vi. 5, 19; xiv. 5; Jno. ix. 33; xi. 37; Luke viii. 19; xix. 3, with preponderance of authority; there is good evidence on the other hand for ἐδύνατο Luke i. 22; Acts xxvi. 32, and Rev. xiv. 3, and ἐδύνασθε 1 Cor.
83 iii. 2. The Aorist ἠδυνήθην is fully established in Matt. xvii. 16, 19; Mark ix. 28; Luke ix. 40; 1 Cor. iii. 1. See on these current Attic forms Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 32; Bttm. I. 317; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 554; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. p. 208; Boisson. Aen. Gaz. p. 173, and Anecd. V. p. 19; cf. Bornem. Act. p. 278.

c. But neither ἠβουλόμην Acts xv. 37; xxviii. 18 nor ἠβουλήθην 2 Jno. 12 (Mtth. 375) is sufficiently attested; see Bornem. Act. 233.

2. The syllabic Augment in a verb beginning with a vowel occurs, Jno. xix. 32 f. κατέαξαν 1st Aor. from κατάγνυμι (cf. Thom. M. 498), and even in the other Moods, as κατεαγῶσι Jno. xix. 31, Bttm. II. 97; cf. Thuc. 3, 89; Aristot. anim. 9, 43; Plat. Cratyl. 389 b. and c.[1] Also Fut. κατεάξω Matt. xii. 20 and Sept., to distinguish it from the Fut. of the verb κατάγω. On the other hand, instead of ἐωνησάμην, in which verb the syllabic Augment is most usual in Greek authors, we find Acts vii. 16 ὠνησάμην, as sometimes in classic Greek (Lob. 139); and for ἔωσα, ἐωσάμην Acts

[1] In Cinnam. p. 190, we find besides an unusual form of the Perfect, κατεάγηκε.

vii. 27, 39, 45, *ὦσα*, *ὠσάμην*, see § 15. Cf. similar instances in Poppo, Thuc. III. II. p. 407 ; Index to Leo Gramm. p. 533.

3. In verbs beginning with *ευ* we find

a. Unaugmented *εὐδόκησα* preponderating, only in Matt. xvii. 5; 1 Cor. x. 5 ; Col. i. 19 ; Heb. x. 6, 8 is *ηὐδόκησα* favored by the Codd. Also *εὐλόγησα* predominant over *ηὐλόγησα* (Matt. xiv. 19 ; Luke xxiv. 30 ; Heb. xi. 20, 21). Likewise Perf. *εὐλόγηκεν* Heb. vii. 6 ; *εὔχοντο* Acts xxvii. 29, *εὐχαρίστησε* Acts xxvii. 35, *εὐπορεῖτο* Acts xi. 29 ; *εὑρίσκειν* decidedly (only Mark xiv. 55 is *ηὕρισκον* supported by good Codd. ; further, cf. Acts vii. 46 ; Luke xix. 48), cf. Lob. p. 140, and Soph. Ai. p. 123 ; Hm. Eurip. Bacch. p. 11 ; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 75. Even in Attic the Augm. is defended by Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 191, and it occurs frequently in the Apocr. (Evang. Nicod. c. 20) and the Fathers. 69 7th ed

b. With Augm. *ηὐχόμην* preponderating Rom. ix. 3 (without Augm. see Xen. Anab. 4, 8, 25 ; Cyrop. 3, 2, 15, yet not without var.), *ηὐχαρίστησαν* Rom. i. 21, *ηὐφόρησεν* Luke xii. 16 (doubtful), *ηὐκαίρουν* Mark vi. 31 (on the other hand Acts xvii. 21 doubtful), *ηὐφράνθη* Acts ii. 26 (from Sept.). Cf. generally Bttm. I. 321 ; Poppo, Thuc. I. 227, also Lehm. Lucian II. p. 456. *Εὐαγγελίζ.* has the Augm. after *ευ*, and that without var. Acts viii. 35, 40 ; xvii. 18 ; 1 Cor. xv. 1 ; Gal. iv. 13 ; Rev. x. 7, etc. (see Lob. p. 269), even *προευηγγελίσατο* Gal. iii. 8. So also *εὐαρεστεῖν* Heb. xi. 5 (yet Cod. A and several others, without Augm.). Of *προσεύχεσθαι* the forms nearly always have Augm. without var., as *προσηύξατο* Matt. xxvi. 44, *προσηύχετο* Mark i. 35 ; Acts viii. 15 ; Luke xxii. 41, etc. 84

4. The only verb beginning with *οι* which occurs in past tenses, *οἰκοδομεῖν*, has, not indeed without var., but on vastly preponderating authority, the regular Augment ; as, *ᾠκοδόμησε* Matt. vii. 24 ; xxi. 33, *ᾠκοδόμητο* Luke iv. 29, *ᾠκοδόμουν* Luke xvii. 28, *ᾠκοδομήθη* Jno. ii. 20. Only in Acts vii. 47, good Codd. have *οἰκοδόμησε*, on which later form see Lob. 153. 67 6th ed

5. *Προφητεύειν* has in Jude 14 with preponderating authority the Augment after the preposition, as usual (Bttm. I. 335) ; but the better Codd. give elsewhere forms like *ἐπροφήτευσαν* Matt. xi. 13, *ἐπροφητεύσαμεν* Matt. vii. 22, *ἐπροφήτευσε* Matt. xv. 7 ; Mark vii. 6 ; Luke i. 67 ; Jno. xi. 51, *ἐπροφήτευον* Acts xix. 6. Schulz ad Matt. vii. 22, advised that the latter should be everywhere received into the text, and this Lchm. and Tdf. have done. In later writers the Augment is often put before the preposition ; as,

ἐπρόσθηκεν, ἐσυμβούλευον (see Index to Ducas, to Jo. Cananus and others, in the Bonn ed.), ἐκατήχουν Epiphan. Mon. 33, 16.[1] In προφητεύειν, however, this is less surprising, as there was no simple φητεύειν; cf. Num. xi. 25 f; Sir. xlviii. 13.

6. The Augment of the form εἴληφα (for the unusual λέληφα, Bttm. I. 316), is transferred also to the 1st Aor., κατειλήφθη for κατελήφθη Jno. viii. 4, not without var. (see Maittaire, dialectt. ed. Sturz, p. 58); traces of this already existed in Ionism.

7. A double Augment occurs,

a. In ἀπεκατεστάθη Matt. xii. 13; Mark iii. 5; Luke vi. 10, now
70 properly in the text (cf. Lucian, Philopat. c. 27 ἀπεκατέστησε,
7th ed. Ducas 29 ἀπεκατέστησαν, Theophan. p. 374 ἀπεκατέστη, Cinnam. p. 259 ἀντεκατέστην; see Dindorf, Diod. S. p. 539, and Schäf. Plutarch. V. p. 198).[2]

b. In ἀνέῳξεν Jno. ix. 14, 30, ἀνεῴχθη Luke i. 64 (Bttm. II. 250), once even in Aor. Inf. ἀνεῳχθῆναι Luke iii. 21. Good Codd. give, further, many other forms in this verb, viz. ἤνοιξεν Rev. xii. 16 etc., ἠνοίχθησαν Rev. xx. 12, ἠνοίγην Acts xii. 10; Rev. xi. 19; xv. 5, as in Sept. and later writers (Bttm. as above 251; Lob. p. 153), and with a threefold augment, Matt. ix. 30 ἠνεῴχθησαν; Jno. ix. 10; Acts xvi. 26; Acts ix. 8; Rev. xix. 11 ἠνεῳγμένον (Nicet. Eugen. 2, 84, 128, var.); var. Jno. ix. 14; Rev. xx. 12 (Gen. vii. 11; viii. 6; Dan. vii. 10; 3 Macc. vi. 18). Cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 669.

85 c. In ἠνείχεσθε 2 Cor. xi. 1, 4, text. rec. (cf. Thuc. 5, 45, Herodi. 8, 5, 9) and ἠνεσχόμην, for ἀνεσχ. Acts xviii. 14 (cf. Her. 7, 159; Thuc. 3, 28) exactly as in Greek writers, who in these forms hardly admit the single Augm. (Bttm. II. 189); yet in 2 Cor. the better Codd. have ἀνείχεσθε.

8. Ἐργάζομαι has, according to Codd., several times ἠργάσατο for εἰργάσατο Matt. xxv. 16; xxvi. 10; Mark xiv. 6; Luke xix. 16; Acts xviii. 3 (Exod. xxxvi. 4). The same form occurs also in a good MS. of Demosth. (Schäf. appar. V. p. 553); cf. Sturz, p. 125. On the other hand, good Codd. (Lchm. and Tdf.) have from ἑλκοῦν in Luke xvi. 20, εἱλκωμένος; cf. also Clem. Al. p. 348 Sylb.

9. The Augm. is for the most part entirely omitted in the forms of the Pluperf.; as, Mark xiv. 44 δεδώκει (xv. 10; Jno. xi. 57),

[1] Epiphanii Mon. edita et inedita cura *A. Dressel.* Paris, 1843. 8vo.

[2] Compare also ἐπροεφήτευον Leo Gramm. pp. 33, 35, and 36, ἐκατεσκεύασαν Canan. 462, ἐσυνεμαρτύρουν ibid. 478, ἠφώρισται Theophan. 112, ἐπροέταξα Theodor. Gramm. 40, 8. As to the Attic Authors, see *V. Fritzsche,* Aristoph. I. 55.

Mark xv. 7 *πεποιήκεισαν* (xvi. 9 *ἐκβεβλήκει*), Luke vi. 48 [var.; Matt. vii. 25] *τεθεμελίωτο*, 1 Jno. ii. 19 *μεμενήκεισαν*, Acts xiv. 8 *περιπεπατήκει* (see Valcken. on the passage), vs. 23 *πεπιστεύκεισαν*. In consistency, these forms are to be preferred in the N. T. text. Ionic prose authors also (Her. 1, 122. 3, 42. 9, 22) and Attic (e.g. Plato) drop the Augm. in the Pluperf. often, especially in forms that would offend the ear (Bttm. I. 318), particularly in compounds (cf. Acts xiv. 8); (see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 179; Poppo, Thuc. I. p. 228; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 272; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 68; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. pp. 265, 284); cf. Thuc. 8, 92; Xen. C. 3, 2, 24. As to the later writers see especially the Index to Joa. Cinnam. Bonn ed. 68 8th ed.

10. The reduplication after the analogy of *μέμνημαι* (Bttm. I. 315) appears in *μνηστεύεσθαι*: Luke i. 27; ii. 5 *μεμνηστευμένη*, not, however, without the opposition of good Codd. Cf. Sept. Deut. xx. 7; xxii. 23 sqq. On *ῥεραντισμένοι* Heb. x. 22, see § 13, 1. b.

In the best Codd. the Aor. of the compound *ἐπαισχύνομαι* 2 Tim. i. 16, is formed without the temp. Aug. *ἐπαισχύνθη*, and recent editors have admitted it into the text. So also Luke xiii. 13, *ἀνορθώθη*.

§ 13. RARE FORMS IN THE TENSES AND PERSONS OF REGULAR VERBS.

1. a. Tenses which in other respects follow completely the analogy of the 2d Aor., have in the Sept. the termination *α* and so forth (of the 1st Aor.) (see Sturz, dial. Alex. p. 61; Valckenaer, Herod. p. 649, 91; Dorville, Charit. p. 402; Wolf, Demosth. Lept. p. 216), e.g. *εἴδαμεν* 1 Sam. x. 14, *εἶδαν* and *ἔφυγαν* 2 Sam. x. 14, *εὗραν* xvii. 20, *ἐφάγαμεν* xix. 42, *ἐλθάτω* Esth. v. 4 (Prov. ix. 5; Amos vi. 2; 2 Chron. xxix. 17), etc. In the N. T. modern editors have restored this form, agreeably to the concurrent testimony of the best Codd.[1]: Matt. xxv. 36 *ἤλθατε*, *ἐξήλθατε*, Matt. xxvi. 39 *παρελθάτω*, 2 Thess. ii. 13 *εἵλατο*, Acts vii. 10; xii. 11 *ἐξείλατο*, vii. 21 *ἀνείλατο*, Gal. v. 4 *ἐξεπέσατε*, Rev. vii. 11 (Heb. iii. 17; Jno. xviii. 6) *ἔπεσαν*, Jno. vi. 10 *ἀνέπεσαν*, Heb. ix. 12 *εὑράμενος*, (Epiph. Opp. I. 619; Theodoret, Opp. II. 837, Hal.) cf. Acts ii. 23; xvii. 6; xii. 7; xvi. 37; xxii. 7; xxviii. 16; Matt. vii. 13, 25; xi. 7 f.; 71 7th ed. 86

[1] Respecting the MSS. which have this form, see *Hug*, Einleit. I. S. 238, 242, 244, 247, 249, 263; *Scholz*, curae crit. p. 40; *Rinck*, lucubratt. p. 37; *Tdf.* prolegg. ad Cod. Ephraemi, p. 21.

xvii. 6; xxii. 22; xxv. 36; xxvi. 39, 55; Luke ii. 16; xi. 52; xxii. 52; Rom. xv. 3; 1 Cor. x. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 17; 1 Jno. ii. 19; Rev. v. 8, 14; vi. 13. In the Codd. we find, to be sure, no sort of consistency in respect either to the writers or to the words.[1]

69 In many passages where this form appears in only a few Codd. it
6th ed. might be attributed to the transcribers,[2] particularly where similar flexions in *a* precede or follow; see Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 232 Lips.; Fr. Mr. 638 sqq. Further, it is found mainly in the 1st Per. Sing. and Plur. or 2d or 3d Per. Plur. In the 2d Sing., on the other hand, the Imperative and the Partic., it very seldom occurs. On instances of such Aor. in Greek authors (e.g. Orpheus) see Bttm. I. 404. *Προσέπεσα* occurring in Eurip. Troad. 293 Seidler has changed into *προσέπεσον*; and in Alcest. 477 undoubtedly *πέσοι* should be read for *πέσειε*, see Herm. on the passage.[3] On the other hand, we find in Theophan. p. 283 *ἔπεσαν*, Achill. Tat. 3, 17 *κατεπέσαμεν*, c. 19 *περιεπέσαμεν*, and Eustath. amor. Ism. I. p. 4. should, on the authority of good Codd., be amended *ἐκπέσειε*, see Jacobs p. 664; cf. besides Lob. 183; Mtth. I. 424 f. In the

72 Byzantine writers various forms of this sort unquestionably occur,
7th ed. e.g. *ἦλθαν* Malalas 18, p. 465; 12, p. 395, *ἀνῆλθαν* 15, p. 389, *ἤνραμεν* 18, p. 449, *ἀπέλθατε* Ducas 24, *ἐξέλθατε* Leo Gr. p. 343, *ἐπεισέλθατε*

87 ibid. p. 337. Cf. in general the Index to Ducas, p. 639, and to Theophan. p. 682 sq. Bonn.

b. The past tenses of verbs beginning with *ρ* are found in the best Codd. with a single *ρ* (cf. § 5 No. 4); as, 2 Cor. xi. 25 *ἐραβδίσθην*, Heb. ix. 19 *ἐράντισε* (x. 22 *ἐραντισμένοι*), Matt. xxvi. 67 *ἐράπισαν*, according to AD 2 Tim. iii. 11 *ἐρύσατο*, according to AC [Sin.] iv. 17 *ἐρύσθην*; cf. 2 Kings xxiii. 18; Exod. v. 23; vii. 10; Lev. xiv. 7, 51; Num. viii. 7. Such forms are confessedly poetic, Bttm. I. 84; Mtth. I. 124, yet they frequently occur also in the Codd. of Greek prose, Bast, comment. crit. p. 788. In the Perf. the Codd.

[1] They are mostly verbs whose 1st Aor. is not in use.

[2] Ἀνάπεσαι, which, according to good Codd., occurs in Luke xiv. 10; xvii. 7 (a trace of it appears in Polyb. 6, 37, 4, *ἐκπεσαμένοις* var.), must be the Imperat. of a similarly formed Aor. Mid. (*ἀνεπεσάμην*). As, however, the latter nowhere occurs, *ἀνάπεσαι* is probably to be regarded as a mistake of the copyist (copyists often interchanged *ε* and *αι*) for *ἀνάπεσε*, which, in fact, is the reading of the best Codd., and has been recently received into the text; cf. also *Rinck*, lucubratt. p. 330. Besides, it is only the 2d Aor. Act. of this verb that is found, Matt. xv. 35; Mark vi. 40; Luke xi. 37; xxii. 14; Jno. vi. 10, etc. The Fut. (as *πίεσαι*), for which *Fr.* Mr. p. 641 is disposed to take these forms, does not accord well with the construction, particularly as in the second passage Imperatives immediately follow.

[3] On the other hand, a Greek inscription in *Böckh*, II. 220 has, distinctly, *εὕρειαν*.

Al. [Sin.] and Ephraem. Heb. x. 22, give the reduplicated form *ῥεραντισμένοι*, of which, besides the Homeric (Odyss. 6, 59) *ῥερυπωμένα*, several examples occur in later writers, Lob. paralip. 13. So in Matt. ix. 36 the Cod. Cantab. gives *ῥεριμμένοι*, which Lchm. has adopted.

c. The Futures of verbs in *ιζω* sometimes are found (with unimportant var. in Codd.) in the contracted form; as, *μετοικιῶ* Acts vii. 43, *ἀφοριεῖ* Matt. xxv. 32, *ἀφοριοῦσι* Matt. xiii. 49, *γνωριοῦσι* Col. iv. 9, *καθαριεῖ* Heb. ix. 14, *διακαθαριεῖ* Matt. iii. 12, *ἐλπιοῦσι* Matt. xii. 21, *μακαριοῦσι* Luke i. 48, etc. This is an Atticism (though the same form was not foreign to the Ionians also); cf. Georgi, Hieroc. I. p. 29; Fischer, Weller. II. p. 355; Mtth. I. p. 402. Of *βαπτίζω* the common form *βαπτίσει* alone is used Matt. iii. 11. On *στηρίζω* see § 15. In the Sept. verbs in *αζω* also are inflected after the same analogy in the Future, e.g. *ἐργᾶται* Lev. xxv. 40, *ἁρπᾷ* xix. 13, etc. Such Attic Futures of contract verbs 70
some have wished to find in Matt. ii. 4 *γεννᾶται*, Jno. xvi. 17 *θεωρεῖτε* 6th el
(on account of *ὄψεσθε* following), Matt. xxvi. 18 *ποιῶ*; but all these are Presents. See § 41, 2; cf. Fr. Mt. as above, Mtth. p. 403 f.

d. Of verbs in *αινω*, *λευκαίνω* has in the Aor. the Attic form (Bttm. I. 439) *λευκᾶναι* Mark ix. 3, and *βασκαίνω* Gal. iii. 1 in var. has the equally classic form *ἐβάσκηνα*. But *σημαίνω* has Aor. *ἐσήμανα* Acts xi. 28; Rev. i. 1, see below, § 15. *Μωραίνω* 1 Cor. i. 20 and *ξηραίνω* Jas. i. 11, have the *α* as verbs in *ραίνω* do regularly. Respecting *φᾶναι* see § 15, p. 89.

e. Futures Subjunctive are occasionally noted in individual passages, from a greater or less number of Codd., e.g. 1 Cor. xiii. 3 *καυθήσωμαι* (adopted by Griesbach), 1 Pet. iii. 1 *κερδηθήσωνται*, 1 Tim. vi. 8 *ἀρκεσθησώμεθα* (in both passages without much authority). In the better class of authors such forms probably originate with the transcribers, see Abresch in Observatt. misc. III. p. 13; Lob. 721; but in later writers, and the Scholiasts particularly (cf. Thuc. 3, 11 and 54), they cannot be rejected (see Niebuhr, ind. ad Agath. p. 418, and ind. to Theophan. p. 682). In the N. T., however, there is very little authority for these Subjunctives. 7
Quite isolated are *εὑρήσῃς* Rev. xviii. 14 and *εὑρήσωσιν* Rev. ix. 6 7th
(yet an Aor. *εὑρῆσαι* also occurs, see Lob. p. 721), *γνώσωνται* Acts 8
xxi. 24 (yet cf. Lob. p. 735). (*ὄψησθε* Luke xiii. 28 and *δώσῃ* Jno. xvii. 2, are unquestionably Aor.)

2. Peculiar personal endings are:

a. The 2d Per. Sing. Pres. and Fut. Pass. and Mid. in *ει* for *ῃ*;

as, *βούλει* Luke xxii. 42, *παρέξει* vii. 4 (var.), *ὄψει* Matt. xxvii. 4 and Jno. xi. 40 (var.). Cf. also Matt. xxvii. 4; Acts xvi. 31; xxiv. 8 (var.). In the two verbs *ὄπτεσθαι* and *βούλεσθαι* this is the form invariably used in Attic (Bttm. I. 348); in other verbs it seldom occurs, and almost exclusively in the poets (cf. Valcken. ad Phoen. p. 216 sq.; Fischer ad Weller. I. p. 119, II. p. 399; Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 34; Schwarz ad Olear. p. 225), yet it appears in good MSS. even of Attic prose, Bttm. as above; but cf. Schneider, praef. ad Plat. civ. I. p. 49 sqq.

b. In the 2d Per. Sing. we find the original uncontracted form not only in *δύνασαι* (Matt. v. 36; viii. 2; Mark i. 40) where it continued to be the usual form, Bttm. I. 502 (yet cf. *δύνῃ* Mark ix. 22; Rev. ii. 2, and var. Luke xvi. 2,[1] which at first was used only by the poets, subsequently by prose authors also, e.g. Polyb. 7, 11, 5; Aelian. 13, 32, see Lob. 359), but we find it also in contract verbs, *ὀδυνᾶσαι* Luke xvi. 25 (Aeschyl. Choëph. 354), *καυχᾶσαι* Rom. ii. 17; 1 Cor. iv. 7, and *κατακαυχᾶσαι* Rom. xi. 18; cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 184; Bttm. I. 347; Boisson. Anecd. IV. p. 479. See *πίνω* below.

c. In the 3d Per. Plur. of the Perfect *αν* for *ασι* (from the
71 old termination *αντι*); as, *ἔγνωκαν* Jno. xvii. 7, *τετήρηκαν* xvii. 6,
8th ed. *εἴρηκαν* Rev. xix. 3, also Luke ix. 36 and Col. ii. 1 *ἑώρακαν* in very good Codd., likewise Rev. xxi. 6; Jas. v. 4. So also in Sept., e.g. Deut. xi. 7; Judith vii. 10 (Acta apocr. p. 235). This form belongs to the Alexandrian dialect; cf. Sext. Emp. 1, 10, p. 261, and the Papyri Taurin. p. 24 (*κεκυρίευκαν*); but occurs also in Lycophr. 252 (*πέφρικαν*), in inscriptions and often in the Byzantine writers (cf. Index to Ducas p. 639, to Codin. and Leo Gramm.); see Bttm. I. 345. Tdf. has received it into the text in all the above passages of the N. T. But in Rev. ii. 3 he has rejected [yet not in ed. vii.] the form *κεκοπίακες* (Exod. v. 22) found in AC.

d. The 1st Aor. Opt. has the original Æolic termination *εια*, *ειας*, *ειε*, instead of *αιμι*; as, *ψηλαφήσειαν* Acts xvii. 27, *ποιήσειαν* Luke
89 vi. 11. So very frequently (in 2d and 3d Sing. and 3d Plur.) in Attic authors: Thuc. 6, 19. 8, 6; Aristoph. Plut. 95; Plat. rep. I. 337 c.; Gorg. 500 c.; Xen. An. 7, 7, 30, etc.; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 150 sq.; Bttm. I. 354 f., and still more frequently in later authors. See Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. p. 353.

74 e. The 3d Per. Plur. of the Imperative in *τωσαν* occurs repeat-
7th ed.

[1] As to this form, which some would exchange for *δύνᾳ*, compare *Porson*, Eurip. Hec. 257; *Schäf.* and *Hm.* Soph. Philoct. 787; *Oudend.* ad Thom. M. p. 252; *Lob.* p. 359.

edly in the N. T.; as, 1 Cor. vii. 9 *γαμησάτωσαν*, vii. 36 *γαμείτωσαν*, 1 Tim. v. 4 *μανθανέτωσαν* (Tit. iii. 14), cf. Acts xxiv. 20; xxv. 5. The assertion of Elmsley, Eurip. Iphig. T. p. 232, ed. Lips., that this form did not become usual till after Aristotle's time, has been fully refuted by Mtth. I. 442 and Bornem. Xen. An. p. 38.

f. The 3d Per. Plur. of the historical tenses has often, in good Codd., the termination *οσαν* (Bttm. I. 346); as, Jno. xv. 22, 24 *εἴχοσαν* for *εἶχον*, xix. 3 *ἐδίδοσαν* for *ἐδίδουν*, 2 Thess. iii. 6 *παρελάβοσαν*, and Rom. iii. 13 from Sept. *ἐδολιοῦσαν*. This termination is much used in the Sept. and by the Byzantines; as, Exod. xv. 27 *ἤλθοσαν*, Josh. v. 11 *ἐφάγοσαν*, Exod. xvi. 24 *κατελίποσαν*, xviii. 26 *ἐκρίνοσαν*, Niceph. Greg. 6, 5, p. 113 *εἴδοσαν*, Nicet. Chon. 21, 7, p. 402 *κατήλθοσαν*, Niceph. Bryenn. p. 165 *μετήλθοσαν*, Brunck, Analect. II. p. 47; cf. also 1 Macc. vi. 31; Cant. iii. 3; v. 7; vi. 8; Josh. ii. 1; iii. 14; v. 11; vi. 14; viii. 19; Judg. xix. 11; i. 6; Ruth i. 4; Lam. ii. 14; Ezek. xxii. 11; Exod. xxxiii. 8, etc., Fischer, Weller. II. p. 336 sq.; Georgi, Hierocr. I. p. 165 sq.; Lob. Phryn. 349, and pathol. 485; Sturz, p. 58 sqq. In the N. T. however, with the exception of Rom. as above, only single Codd. give this form, and it may possibly be attributable everywhere to the Alexandrian transcribers.

3. Of contracted verbs we must note

a. The Future *ἐκχεῶ* Acts ii. 17, 18 Sept., after the manner of verbs in *λ*, *μ*, *ν*, *ρ*, cf. LXX. Ezek. vii. 8; xxi. 31; Jer. xiv. 16; Hos. v. 10; Zech. xii. 10; Bttm. I. p. 369. Were it accented *ἐκχέω*, it would be, according to Elmsley, the Attic Fut., as this form is both Pres. and Fut.; see Bttm. II. 325. But in Sept. with the same accent it is further inflected, *ἐκχεεῖς*, *ἐκχεεῖτε*, Exod. iv. 9; xxix. 12; xxx. 18; Deut. xii. 16.

b. The usual forms of the two verbs *διψάω*, *πεινάω*, in the (Attic) literary language were Inf. *διψῆν*, *πεινῆν*, and Indic. *διψῇς*, *διψῇ*, etc., Bttm. I. 487. In the N. T. we find instead *διψᾶν*, *διψᾷ* Rom. xii. 20; Jno. vii. 37, *πεινᾶν* Phil. iv. 12, *πεινᾷ* Rom. xii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 21, which first occurs after the time of Aristot. (Anim. 72
9, 31, cf. Sallier ad Thom. M. p. 699; Lob. 61). According to 6th ed
the same analogy we find Fut. *πεινάσω* (for *πεινήσω*) Rev. vii. 16; 90
Jno. vi. 35 var. (Isa. v. 27; Psalm xlix. 12), and 1st Aor. *ἐπείνασα* Mark ii. 25; xi. 12; Matt. xii. 1, 3; xxv. 35; Luke iv. 2. Both forms are peculiarities of later Greek; see Lob. 204.

c. Of verbs in *εω*, retaining *ε* in the Fut. etc. (Lob. paral. 435), we find in the N. T. *καλέσω*, *τελέσω* (Bttm. I. p. 392), also *φορέσω*

and *ἐφόρεσα* 1 Cor. xv. 49 (Sir. 11, 5 ; Palaeph. 52, 4). In the classics the usual form is *φορήσω* ; yet even Isaeus has *φορέσαι*, see Bttm. II. 315. (On the other hand *εὐφόρησεν* Luke xii. 16.) On *ἀπολέσω* and *ἐπαινέσω*, see below, § 15.

§ 14. RARE INFLECTIONS OF VERBS IN MI AND OF IRREGULAR VERBS.

75 1. Of verbs in *μι* we find :

7th ed. a. Pluper. Act. *ἑστήκεσαν* Rev. vii. 11 var. for *ἑστήκεισαν* ; cf. Thuc. 1, 15 *ξυνεστήκεσαν*, Xen. An. 1, 4, 4 *ἐφεστήκεσαν*, Heliod. 4, 16 *ἐῴκεσαν*, cf. particularly Jacobs, Achill. Tat. pp. 400, 622 ; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 77.

b. 3d Per. Plur. Pres. *τιθέασι* for *τιθεῖσι* Matt. v. 15, *περιτιθέασι* Mark xv. 17, *ἐπιτιθέασι* Matt. xxiii. 4. This is the better and more usual form ; cf. Thuc. 2, 34 ; Aristot. Metaph. 11. 1 ; Theophr. plant. 2, 6 ; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 145 sq., who adduces many instances, and Mtth. I. 483 ; Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 250. Similarly *διδόασι* Rev. xvii. 13, according to the best Codd. ; cf. Her. I. 93 ; Thuc. I. 42. The contracted forms *τιθεῖσι* and especially *διδοῦσι* belong to the later language ; Lob. p. 244.

c. In the Imperf. the 3d Per. Plur. has the contracted form *ἐδίδουν* for *ἐδίδοσαν* in compounds, Acts iv. 33 ; xxvii. 1 ; cf. Hesiod. *ἔργ.* 123. In the Sing. the form *ἐδίδουν* is more common ; Bttm. I. 509.

d. On the abbreviated but very (perhaps only) common Inf. Perf. Act. *ἑστάναι* (for *ἑστηκέναι*) 1 Cor. x. 12, see Bttm. II. 26 f., cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 182 sq.

e. The Imperative Pres. Pass. in several Codd. is *περιΐστασο* 2 Tim. ii. 16 ; Tit. iii. 9 (*ἀφίστασο* 1 Tim. vi. 5 var.) for which *περιΐστω* etc. is more usual ; see Th. M. p. 75 ; Mtth. I. 495.

f. There are weighty authorities for forms like *ἱστῶμεν* Rom.
91 iii. 31, *συνιστῶντες* 2 Cor. vi. 4 ; x. 18 (Niceph. Bryenn. p. 41, cf. *καθιστῶν* Agath. 316, 2), *ἀποκαθιστᾷ* Mark ix. 12 (Dan. ii. 21 ; 2 Sam. xviii. 12 ; Fabric. Pseudep. II. 610 ; *ξυνιστᾷ* Plat. Tim. 33 a.) from the form *ἱστάω* (Her. 4, 103, as *ἀφιστάω* Joa. Cinnam. p. 121, *ἐφιστάω* p. 65, *καθιστάω* p. 104) ; see Grammatici graeci, ed. Dind. I. 251 ; Dorville, Charit. p. 542 ; Mtth. I. 482. Similarly *ἐμπιπλῶν* (from *ἐμπιπλάω*) Acts xiv. 17, cf. *ἐμπιπρῶν* Leo Diac. 2, 1.

g. Optat. Pres. *δῴη* for *δοίη* Rom. xv. 5 ; 2 Tim. i. 16, 18 (ii. 7) ; Eph. i. 17 ; iii. 16 ; Jno. xv. 16, *ἀποδῴη* 2 Tim. iv. 14. This is a

later form, (in Plat. Gorg. 481 a., Lys. c., Andoc. p. 215, T. IV. recent editors have restored δῷ, and in Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 35 even Schneider changed δῴης into δοίης), see Sept. Gen. xxvii. 28; xxviii. 4; Num. v. 21; xi. 29, etc., Themist. or. 8, p. 174 d.; Philostr. Apoll. 1. 34; Dio Chr. 20. 267; Aristeas, p. 120, Haverc. etc., which the ancient grammarians reject (Phryn. p. 345; Moeris p. 117); cf. Lob. 346; Sturz, 52; Bttm. in Mus. antiq. stud. I. 238.[1] 73 6th ed.

h. From βαίνω, 2d Aor. ἔβην, we find the Imperative ἀνάβα Rev. iv. 1, κατάβα Mark xv. 30 var. (on the contrary κατάβηθι Matt. xxvii. 40; Jno. iv. 49, μετάβηθι vii. 3; cf. Thom. Mag. p. 495, and Oudendorp, h. l.). Similarly Eurip. Electr. 113; Aristoph. Acharn. 262, and Vesp. 979; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 153 sq.; Bttm. II. 125. Quite analogous is ἀνάστα Acts xii. 7; Eph. v. 14; cf. Theocrit. 24, 36; Menand. p. 48; Mein. Aesop. 62, de Fur. (but ἀνάστηθι Acts ix. 6, 34, ἐπίστηθι 2 Tim. iv. 2), also ἀπόστα protev. Jac. 2., παράστα Acta apocr. 51. 76 7th ed.

i. The N. T. Codd. vary as to the form of the Perf. Part. Neut. of ἵστημι. Yet the better Codd. have in the two passages Matt. xxiv. 15; Mark xiii. 14 [A.C. Sin. also in Rev. xiv. 1] ἑστός (ἑστηκός), exactly as the oldest and best Codd. of Greek authors (Bttm. II. 208), and this form Bekker in Plato prefers throughout. Elsewhere the uncontracted forms of this participle not unfrequently occur in good MSS. of the N. T., as Matt. xxvii. 47 ἑστηκότων Mark ix. 1; xi. 5, ἑστηκώς Jno. iii. 29; vi. 22, παρεστηκόσιν Mark xiv. 69, and, for the most part, have been received into the text.

The (pretty well attested) form δώσῃ Jno. xvii. 2; Rev. viii. 3 (xiii. 16 δώσωσιν) occurs also Theocrit. 27, 21, and is, according to some, Doric. In Theocrit. indeed it has for a long time been corrected to δώσει; yet δώσῃ occurs often enough in later writers (Lob. 721; cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 871; Index ad Theophan.), and probably may be classed among the corrupt forms in which the popular speech indulged.

2. From εἰμί we find: 92

a. The Imperat. ἤτω for ἔστω (which in the N. T. is also the usual form) 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Jas. v. 12 (Ps. civ. 31; 1 Macc. x. 31; cf. Clem. Alex. strom. 6, 275; Acta Thom. 3, 7) Bttm. I. 529; only once in Plato, rep. 2, 361 d., see Schneider, h. l. According to Heraclides (in Eustath. p. 1411, 22) the inflection is Doric. The other Imperative form ἴσθι occurs in Matt. ii. 13; v. 25; Mark v. 34; Luke xix. 17; 1 Tim. iv. 15 (Bttm. I. 527).

[1] This form is surprising also in the N. T., as it everywhere stands where otherwise according to the idiom of the N. T. the Subjunctive would stand.

b. The form ἤμην Imperf. Mid. 1st Per. Sing. (Bttm. I. 527), which is rejected by the Atticists and became quite usual (particularly with ἄν, as in the N. T. once in Gal. i. 10) only in later writers (Lob. 152; Schäf. Long. 423; Valcken. in N. T. I. 478), is the common form; as, Matt. xxv. 35; Jno. xi. 15; Acts x. 30;
74 xi. 5, 17; 1 Cor. xiii. 11, etc.; cf. Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 3; ἤμεθα
6th ed. for ἦμεν occurs (Matt. xxiii. 30) twice in very good Codd., and has already been received into the text by Griesbach. Also Acts xxvii. 37; Lchm., agreeably to A [Sin.] and B, adopted it. On the other hand, in Gal. iv. 3; Eph. ii. 3 it has little authority. The form does not occur in any good writer; yet see Epiphan. Opp. II. 333; Malal. 16, p. 404.

c. For ἦσθα Mark xiv. 67, Codd. of little weight have ἦς, rare in Attic, and almost doubtful (Bttm. I. 528). As to its use in later Greek, see Lob. 149.

77 Note. ἔνι Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 11; Jas. i. 17 (doubtful in 1 Cor. vi. 5),
7th ed. cf. Sir. 37, 2, is usually considered (with the ancient grammarians, cf. Schol. ad Aristoph. Nub. 482) to be contracted from ἔνεστι, and this opinion is defended also by Fr. Mr. p. 642. It is probably better, however, with Bttm. II. 375, to take it for the preposition ἔνι (ἐν, ἐνί with the accent thrown back) which, like ἔπι, πάρα, etc., is used without εἶναι; as the supposed contraction would be harsh, and without example. Bttm.'s view, moreover, is supported by the analogy of ἔπι and πάρα, the latter of which can hardly be a contraction from πάρεστι, cf. Krü. 26. This ἔνι is very frequent in Attic, both in poetry and prose; Georgi, Hierocr. I. 152; Schwarz, Comm. 486. The poets use it for ἔνεισι, as ἔπι for ἔπεισι, Il. 20, 248; Odyss. 9, 126; πάρα, however, is connected even with the 1st Person.[1]

3. With the primitive verb ἴημι the following forms are connected:

a. ἀφέωνται Matt. ix. 2, 5; Mark ii. 5; Luke v. 20, 23; vii. 47; 1 Jno. ii. 12. Ancient grammarians are not agreed in accounting
93 for this form. Some, as Eustathius (Iliad, 6, 590) consider it equivalent to ἀφῶνται, in the same way as ἀφέῃ is used by Homer for ἀφῇ. Others, more correctly, take it for the Preterite (instead of ἀφεῖνται); so Herodian, the Etymol. Mag. and Suidas, — yet with this difference, that the last ascribes it to the Doric dialect, the author of the Etymol. to the Attic. Suidas is undoubtedly

[1] The Etymol. M. p. 357, regards ἔνι, not as a contraction of ἔνεστι, but as an ellipsis, requiring the suitable person of the verb εἶναι to be supplied. Moreover, whether ἔν also occurs for ἔνι, is doubtful, *Hm.* Soph. Trach. 1020.

right; and this Perf. Pass. is traceable to the Perf. Act. *ἀφέωκα*, cf. Fischer, de vitiis lex. p. 646 sqq.; Bttm. I. 521.

b. *ἤφιε* Mark i. 34; xi. 16 (Philo leg. ad Cajum p. 1021) is the Imperf. of *ἀφίω* (cf. *ἀφίω* Eccl. ii. 18, and *ἀφίομεν* Matt. vi. 12 var.), like *ξύνιον* for *ξυνίεσαν* Iliad, 1, 273 (Bttm. I. 523), with the Augm. on the preposition (which occurs elsewhere also in this verb, as *ἠφείθη* Plutarch, Sulla 28) for *ἀφίει* (Bttm. I. 521) see Fischer, Weller. II. 480.

c. The 1st Aor. Pass. of *ἀφίημι* in Rom. iv. 7 (Ps. xxxii. 1) according to most Codd. is *ἀφέθησαν*. Some Codd., however, here and in Sept. give *ἀφείθησαν* with Augm. which is the usual form in Greek authors (Bttm. I. 541).

In Rev. ii. 20 *ἀφεῖς* (Exod. xxxii. 32) from *ἀφέω* has on the authority 75
of good Codd. been received into the text, like *τιθεῖς* for *τίθης* Bttm. I. 506. 6th ed.

From *συνίημι* we have *συνιοῦσι* Matt. xiii. 13 (3d Per. Plur.), 2 Cor. x. 12 (either 3d Plur. or Dative Participle) and Participle *συνιών* Matt. xiii. 23 var. (Rom. iii. 11, from Sept. *συνιῶν*) for *συνιείς*, which Lchm. and Tdf. have in the text. The first form is from *συνιέω*, (which still survives in the Inf. *συνιεῖν*, Theogn. 565). The Participial form, however, espec- 78
ially common in Sept. (1 Chron. xxv. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Ps. xl. 2; 7th ed.
Jer. xx. 12) would perhaps more correctly be written *συνίων* (from *συννίω*, see above, and Bttm. I. 523). Accordingly Lchm. has printed *συνίουσι* Matt. xiii. 13. Cf. in general Fr. Rom. I. 174 seq.

4. From the verb *κάθημαι* we find Imperat. *κάθου* Matt. xxii. 44; Luke xx. 42; Acts ii. 34; Jas. ii. 3 (1 Sam. i. 23; xxii. 5; 2 Kings ii. 2, 6, etc.) instead of *κάθησο*. Only in Mark xii. 36 has Tdf. adopted from B *κάθισον*. The form *κάθου* never occurs in the earlier Greek authors, and therefore Moeris p. 234 and Thom. M. p. 485 class it among spurious forms. So also *κάθῃ* for *κάθησαι* Acts xxiii. 3 (Lob. 395; Greg. Cor. ed. Schäf. p. 411).

Not a few verbs present in the N. T. single forms, regularly constructed, which are rejected for the most part by ancient grammarians, on the ground that they do not occur in Greek authors, or only in the later. Among such forms are reckoned in particular a number of Futures Active, for which standard writers use the Futures Middle (Bttm. II. 84 f.; Monk, Eurip. Alcest. v. 159, 645); but this subject has not yet been completely investigated. We subjoin a list of all such forms as have been declared unclassical,

but mark with an asterisk those about which the grammarians, and in particular Thom. Mag. and Moeris, have been manifestly too fastidious.

ἀγγέλλω. The 2d Aor. Active and Passive, rare in the better authors, are in many passages suspicious, Bttm. II. 94 f.; yet, see Schäf. Demosth. III. 175; Schoem. Isae. p. 39. In the N. T. we find *ἀνηγγέλη* 1 Pet. i. 12, and (from the Sept.) Rom. xv. 21, *διαγγελῇ* (from Sept.) Rom. ix. 17, *κατηγγέλη* Acts xvii. 13.

ἄγνυμι. On the Fut. *κατεάξει* Matt. xii. 20 and Aor. *κατέαξα* see § 12, 2.

**ἄγω.* On the 1st Aor. *ἦξα*, which occurs 2 Pet. ii. 5 in the compound *ἐπάξας*, see Bttm. II. 98; Lob. p. 287, 735. In compounds also the form is not rare (2 Sam. xxii. 35; 1 Macc. ii. 67; Index to Malal. under *ἄγω*; Schäf. ind. ad Aesop. p. 135) even in good
76 prose authors Her. 1, 190; 5, 34; Xen. Hell. 2, 2, 20; Thuc. 2,
6th ed. 97; 8, 25.

**αἱρέω.* The Fut. *ἑλῶ*, in comp. *ἀφελῶ* Rev. xxii. 19, is rare, see Bttm. II. 100. Yet it is found in Agath. 269, 5, and in the Sept. frequently: Exod. v. 8; Num. xi. 17; Deut. xii. 32; Job xxxvi. 7; cf. also Menand. Byz. p. 316. In opposition to Reisig,
79 Comm. crit. in Soph. Oed. C. p. 365, who claims it for Aristoph.
7th ed. and Soph., see Hm. Oed. Col. 1454 and Eurip. Hel. p. 127.

**ἀκούω.* Fut. *ἀκούσω* Matt. xii. 19; xiii. 14; Rom. x. 14; Jno. xvi. 13, for *ἀκούσομαι*, which even in the N. T. is the more frequent, particularly with Luke, as Acts iii. 22 (vii. 37); xvii. 32; xxv. 22; xxviii. 28, also Jno. v. 28. *Ἀκούσω* occurs not only in poets (Anthol. gr. III. 134; Jac. Orac. Sibyll. 8, 206, 345), but occasionally also in prose authors of the *κοινή*, as Dion. H. 980, 4. Reisk., cf. Schäf. Demosth. II. 232; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 153; Bachmann, Lycophr. I. 92. In Sept. cf. Isa. vi. 9; 2 Sam. xiv. 16.

95 *ἄλλομαι* varies between Aor. *ἠλάμην* and *ἠλόμην* Bttm. II. 108. The same variation exists in the Codd. Acts xiv. 10 (even with double λ), yet *ἥλατο* preponderates.

ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτέω. 1st Aor. *ἡμάρτησα* for 2d Aor. *ἥμαρτον* Rom. v. 14, 16; Matt. xviii. 15; Luke xvii. 4; Rom. vi. 15 (1 Sam. xix. 4; Lam. iii. 41[1]) Thom. M. p. 420; Lob. p. 732; yet see Diod. S. 2, 14 *ἁμαρτήσας*, Agath. 167, 18. Also the Fut. Act. *ἁμαρτήσω* Matt. xviii. 21 (Sir. vii. 36; xxiv. 22; Dio Ch. 59, 20) is not very common. Cf. Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 159; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 361.

[1] Still, in the Sept. the 2d Aor. *ἥμαρτον* predominates. See especially 1 Kings viii. 47, *ἡμάρτομεν, ἠνομήσαμεν, ἠδικήσαμεν.*

*ἀνέχομαι. Fut. ἀνέξομαι Matt. xvii. 17; Mark ix. 19; Luke ix. 41; 2 Tim. iv. 3, for which Moeris from pure caprice would have ἀνασχήσομαι. The former occurs very frequently; cf. e.g. Soph. Elect. 1017; Xen. C. 5, 1, 26; Plat. Phaedr. 239 a.

ἀνοίγω. 1st Aor. ἤνοιξα Jno. ix. 17, 21, etc. for ἀνέῳξα (yet cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 5, 13), 2d Aor. Pass. ἠνοίγη Rev. xv. 5, see § 12, 7.

ἀπαντάω. Fut. ἀπαντήσω (for ἀπαντήσομαι) Mark xiv. 13 (Diod. S. 18, 15). See Bttm. II. 114; Mtth. Eurip. Suppl. 774.

ἀποκτείνω. 1st Aor. ἀπεκτάνθη, ἀποκτανθῆναι Rev. ii. 13; ix. 18, 20; xi. 13; xiii. 10; xix. 21; Matt. xvi. 21; Luke ix. 22, etc.; cf. 1 Macc. ii. 9; 2 Macc. iv. 36. This form occurs indeed in Homer, but belongs peculiarly to later Greek prose (Dio C. 65, c. 4; Menander, Hist. p. 284, 304, Bonn ed.). See Bttm. II. 227, Lob. 36, 757.[1] (For the un-Attic Perf. ἀπέκταγκα see 2 Sam. iv. 11; Bttm. 226 f.)

ἀπόλλυμι. Fut. ἀπολέσω Matt. xxi. 41; Mark viii. 35; Jno. vi. 39; xii. 25; cf. Lucian. asin. 33; Long. pastor. 3, 17; Bttm. II. 254. Yet see Lob. 746. (In 1 Cor i. 19, we find the regular form ἀπολῶ.) 80 7th ed. 77 6th ed.

ἁρπάζω. Aor. ἡρπάγην 2 Cor. xii. 2, 4 for ἡρπάσθην (Rev. xii. 5) Thom. Mag. p. 424; Moeris, p. 50; Bttm. I. 372, Fut. ἁρπαγήσομαι 1 Thess. iv. 17. (Also ἁρπάσω for ἁρπάσομαι Jno. x. 28 is said to be a rare form; it occurs, however, in Xen. mag. eq. 4, 17.)

*αὐξάνω. The primitive form αὔξω Eph. ii. 21; Col. ii. 19 is frequent in Plato and Xen., Mtth. 541.

βαρέω. From this comes not only βεβαρημένος Matt. xxvi. 43; Luke ix. 32, but also, contrary to Attic prose usage (Bttm. II. 88), βαρούμενοι 2 Cor. v. 4 (Mark xiv. 40), βαρείσθω 1 Tim. v. 16, and the Aor. ἐβαρήθην Luke xxi. 34; 2 Cor. i. 8, for which last the Greek literary diction employs ἐβαρύνθην (var. Luke as above). 96

βασκαίνω. The Aor. Gal. iii. 1 is given in text. rec. ἐβάσκανε, but in many Codd. ἐβάσκηνε (without an ι subs.); cf. Bttm. I. 438. The latter in Dio C. 44, 39; Herod. 2, 4, 11, and the later writers.

[1] Ἀποκτέννεσθαι (others ἀποκτένεσθαι) occurring in Rev. vi. 11, and ἀποκτέννει (ἀποκτενεῖ var.) in 2 Cor. iii. 6 (Rev. xiii. 10) are considered as Aeolic, the Aeolians being accustomed to change ει before λ, μ, ν, ρ, σ into ε, and double the following consonant; therefore, κτέννω for κτείνω, like σπέρρω for σπείρω, Koenig, Gregor. Cor. pp. 587, 597 Schaef., Mtth. I. 74; cf. Dindorf, praef. ad Aristoph. XII. p. 14. Also in Tob. i. 18; Wisd. xvi. 14, we find the first form among the var. A Present ἀποκτέννω is probably not, with Wahl, to be assumed for Matt. x. 28 and Luke xii. 4; xiii. 34. Ἀποκτενόντων in those passages (if not to be taken for an Aor. Particip., see Fr. Mt. p. 383) may be considered as a corruption of ἀποκτεννόντων, which a few, but good, Codd. have, and which Lchm. and, in part, Tdf. have printed. Cf. besides, Bornem. ad Luc. p. 81.

βιόω. 1st Aor. Inf. *βιῶσαι* in 1 Pet. iv. 2, for which the 2d Aor. *βιῶναι* is more usual in Attic, Bttm. II. 130 f., yet see Aristot. Nic. 9, 8; Plutarch. Opp. II. 367 f., and often in compounds, Steph. Thes. II. 260, ed. nov. The other forms of the 1st Aor. are more frequent, the participle *βιώσας* the most so.

βλαστάνω. Aor. *ἐβλάστησα* for *ἔβλαστον* Matt. xiii. 26; Jas. v. 18 (Gen. i. 11; Num. xvii. 8, etc.; Acta apoc. p. 172); cf. Bttm. II. 131. Since Aristotle's time the form is not unusual even in the Greek literary language; Stephani Thes. II. 273.

**γαμέω.* Aor. *ἐγάμησα* Mark vi. 17; Matt. xxii. 25; 1 Cor. vii. 9 stands for the older form *ἔγημα* (from *γάμω*), as Luke xiv. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 28; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 29; Lob. 742. Yet *ἐγάμησα* is found (if not in Xen. Cyr. 8, 4, 20) Lucian, dial. deor. 5, 4; Apollodor. 3, 15, 3. Better attested is *ἐγαμήθην* Mark x. 12 (though not fully established), 1 Cor. vii. 39; Lob. 742.

γελάω. Fut. *γελάσω* (for *γελάσομαι*) Luke vi. 21. See Bttm. II. 85, 134.

γίγνομαι. Aor. Pass. *ἐγενήθην* for *ἐγενόμην* Acts iv. 4; Col. iv. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 14, etc.; cf. Thom. M. p. 189, — an originally Doric form frequently found in the writers of the *κοινή*, Lob. 109; Bttm. II. 136.

δίδωμι. The 1st Aor. *ἔδωκα* is avoided in the 1st and 2d Per. Plur. by Attic writers, and the 2d Aor. used instead, Bttm. I. 509.
78 In the N. T., however, we find *ἐδώκαμεν* 1 Thess. iv. 2, *ἐδώκατε*
8th ed. Matt. xxv. 35; Gal. iv. 15, etc. as in Demosth. On *δώσῃ* see § 14, 1 Remark p. 79.

**διώκω.* Fut. *διώξω* for *διώξομαι* Matt. xxiii. 34; Luke xxi. 12;
81 Bttm. II. 154. Yet cf. Dem. Nausim. 633 c.; Xen. An. 1, 4, 8
7th ed. (Krü. h. l.); Cyr. 6, 3, 13.

δύναμαι. We have merely to remark here that besides the Aor. *ἐδυνήθην*, the (Ion.) form *ἠδυνάσθην*, with the Augm. *η* too, is noted from B among the var. Matt. xvii. 16 (Bttm. II. 155).

δύω, δύνω. In several good Codd. we find Mark i. 32 the 1st
97 Aor. *ἔδυσα*, which among the earlier Greeks has only a causative meaning, Bttm. II. 156. On the other hand the 1st Aor. *δύναντος*, as inferior authorities give in Luke iv. 40, is found also Ael. 4, 1; Pausan. 2, 11, 7.

εἴδω in the sense of *know.* Pret. *οἴδαμεν* Mark xi. 33; Jno. iii. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 1, etc. for *ἴσμεν* (Poppo, Xen. An. 2, 4, 6), *οἴδατε* Mark x. 38; xiii. 33; 1 Cor. ix. 13; Phil. iv. 15 for *ἴστε*, *οἴδασιν* Luke xi. 44; Jno. x. 5 for *ἴσασι*; see Bttm. I. 546 (yet cf. Aristoph. av.

599; Xen. Oec. 20, 14). The 2d Per. Sing. οἶδας 1 Cor. vii. 16; Jno. xxi. 15 is rather Ionic and Doric (for οἶσθα), yet it occurs Her. 4, 157; Xen. M. 4, 6, 6; Eurip. Alc. 790, and frequently in later Greek; see Lob. 236 sq. The 3d Per. Plur. of the Plup. is written ᾔδεισαν Mark i. 34; Jno. ii. 9; xxi. 4, etc. for ᾔδεσαν; Bttm. I. 547.

εἰπεῖν (2d Aor. εἶπον). 1st Aor. εἶπα in the N. T. in the 2d Per. Sing. Matt. xxvi. 25; Mark xii. 32, and frequently. This person also occurs in Attic, Xen. Oec. 19, 14; Soph. Oed. C. 1509 (along with εἶπες, as often in Plato); but it is originally Ionic, see Greg. Corinth. ed. Schäf. p. 481; Schäf. Dion. H. p. 436 sq. Imper. εἶπατε Matt. x. 27; xxi. 5; Col. iv. 17, εἰπάτωσαν Acts xxiv. 20; likewise very common in Attic, Plat. Lach. 187 d; Xen. C. 3, 2, 28. We find, besides, in good Codd. 3d Per. Plur. Indic. εἶπαν Matt. xii. 2; xvii. 24; Mark xi. 6; xii. 7, 16; Luke v. 33; xix. 39; xx. 2; Acts i. 11, 24; vi. 2; xxviii. 21, etc. (Diod. S. 16, 14; Xen. H. 3, 5, 24 a var.), the Participle εἶπας Acts vii. 37; xxii. 24 which is chiefly Ionic, and even the more unusual 1st Per. εἶπα Heb. iii. 10; Acts xxvi. 15 (εἶπον, on the contrary, predominates in the N. T.); see Sturz, dial. alex. p. 61.[1] Recent editors have adopted these forms wherever they are attested by several Codd. In composition we find ἀπειπάμην 2 Cor. iv. 2 (Her. 6, 100), and προείπαμεν 1 Thess. iv. 6 (εἴπαμεν in the 1. Turin. Papyrus, p. 10). Εἰπόν (not εἶπον, see § 6, 1, k.) Acts xxviii. 26 (according to good Codd.) is to be regarded as 2d Aor. Imperative, a form which we now find also in the text of Mark xiii. 4; Luke x. 40, while in other passages εἰπέ preponderates. The 1st Aor. Pass. of this verb, ἐῤῥήθην (from ῥέω, see Bttm. II. 166), is sometimes written in MSS. of the N. T. Matt. v. 21, 31, 33 ἐῤῥέθην, as often in Codd. of later (non-Attic) authors, though this form occasionally appears in Attic writers also; Lob. 447 (but not in Plato, see Schneider, Plat. civ. II. p. 5 sq.). 82 7th ed. 79 6th ed.

ἐκχέω, later form ἐκχύνω (Lob. 726). From it comes Fut. ἐκχεῶ for ἐκχεύσω Bttm. I. 396. See § 13, 3. a. p. 77.

*ἐλεάω for ἐλεέω occurs in several good Codd. in various passages of the N. T., as Rom. ix. 16, 18 ἐλεῶντος, ἐλεᾷ, Jude 23 ἐλεᾶτε. Also Clem. Al. p. 54, Sylb. (the Florent. edition) has ἐλεᾷ. Cf. also Etymol. M. 327, 30. Similar is ἐλλογᾶν Rom. v. 13; Philem. 18, also in good Codd. The latter has been adopted by Lchm., 98

[1] Εἶπαν occurs also in the well-known Rosetta inscription, at the end of line 8.

and after him by Tdf. Fr., Rom. I. 311, declares all these forms to be errors in copying.

ἕλκω. From this we find, as regularly in Greek authors, a Pres. and an Imperf. Jas. ii. 6; Acts xxi. 30. On the other hand, for the Fut. ἕλξω (Mtth. 573) the more unusual ἑλκύσω occurs Jno. xii. 32 from the other form ἑλκύω; cf. Job xxxix. 10.

*ἐπαινέω. Fut. ἐπαινέσω 1 Cor. xi. 22, for ἐπαινέσομαι; see Bttm. I. 388. Yet cf. Xen. An. 5, 5, 8; Himer. 20. In general, however, this form is not uncommon; see Brunck, Gnom. p. 10, 64; Schaef. Demosth. II. 465; Stallb. Plat. Symp. p. 139.

*ἐπιορκέω. Fut. ἐπιορκήσω for ἐπιορκήσομαι Matt. v. 33. See Bttm. II. 85.

ἔρχομαι. The Fut. ἐλεύσομαι, both in the simple verb and its compounds, is of frequent occurrence, but particularly in later prose authors (Arrian. AI. 6, 12; Philostr. Apoll. 4, 4; Dio Chr. 33, 410; Max. Tyr. 24, p. 295); in Attic, on the contrary, εἶμι is used instead (Phryn. p. 37 sq.; Thom. M. p. 88, 336). Yet in the earlier authors ἐλεύσομαι also is not altogether infrequent, Her. 1, 142; 5, 125; Lys. Dardan. 12 (p. 233, Bremi); see in general Lob. 37 sq.; Schaef. Soph. II. 323; cf. Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. 210. Instead of the Imperf. ἠρχόμην Mark i. 45; ii. 13; Jno. iv. 30; vi. 17, etc. Attic authors commonly use the Imperf. of εἶμι, Bttm. II. 183; yet see Bornem. Luc. p. 106, cf. Thuc. 4, 120, 121; Xen. An. 4, 6, 22. In Attic the imperatives ἴθι, ἴτε from εἶμι are used for ἔρχου, ἔρχεσθε Jno. i. 47. Also ἐρχόμενος is said to be rare in earlier Attic, Bttm. as above; yet it occurs in Plato, Crit. c. 15. (ἦλθε for ἐλήλυθε Gal. iv. 4; Jno. xix. 39, etc. has been too hastily rejected by Thom. M. p. 418; see Sallier on the passage.)

ἐσθίω. From the poetic form ἔσθω (Bttm. II. 185) we find the Participle ἔσθων among the var. Mark i. 6; Luke vii. 33, 34; x. 7; xx. 47; xxii. 30, which Tdf., on the authority of (a few) good Codd., has received into the text; see Praef. p. 21. From Sept. cf. Lev. xvii. 10; xix. 26; Sir. xx. 16.

εὑρίσκω. Aor. Mid. εὑράμην for εὑρόμην Heb. ix. 12, see § 13, 1 (Paus. 7, 11, 1; 8, 30, 4, etc.; cf. Lob. p. 139 sq.). A 1st Aor. εὗρησα appears in the Subjunctive form εὑρήσῃς Rev. xviii. 14 and
99 εὑρήσωσιν ix. 6 (as at least many Codd. have it), unless we take
83 these forms for the Subjunctive Fut. (see § 13, 1. e). Lob. 721,
7th ed. however, produces a Participle εὑρήσαντος.

80 ζάω. Fut. ζήσω Rom. vi. 2, 8; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; 2 Tim. ii. 11;
6th ed. Jno. vi. 51, 58 f. (συζήσω Rom. vi. 8; 2 Tim. ii. 11), ζήσομαι Matt.

iv. 4; Mark v. 23; Jno. vi. 51; xi. 25, etc. 1st Aor. ἔζησα Rev. ii. 8; Luke xv. 24; Rom. vii. 9, etc. (and often in Sept.). These are principally later forms, which occur but seldom in early authors (see Bttm. II. 192). The Aor. is peculiar to later writers. Earlier authors used in the Fut. and Aor. the corresponding tenses of βιόω.

ἥκω. From the 1st Aor. ἧξα, a later form, Bttm. II. 194; Lob. 744, we find the Subjunctive ἥξωσι Rev. iii. 9, where, however, better Codd. have the Fut. ἥξουσι. The Preter. ἧκα (Deut. xxxii. 17; Phot. biblioth. 222; Malal. pp. 136 and 137; Leo Gramm. p. 98, etc.; Lob. 744) in the form ἥκασι Mark viii. 3 is by no means established, though Lchm has adopted it.

θάλλω. 2d Aor. ἀνεθάλετε Phil. iv. 10, a form not occurring in prose, and everywhere rare, Bttm. II. 195.

ἵστημι. The Pres. ἱστάνω Rom. iii. 31, and in composition συνιστάνω 2 Cor. iii. 1 (iv. 2); v. 12; vi. 4; x. 12, 18; Gal. ii. 18, was used in Attic (Mtth. I. 482), but more frequently in later Greek (e.g. Cinnam. 214 and 256 ἐφιστάνειν). On the later form ἱστάω see § 14, 1, f. p. 78.

κατακαίω. Fut. κατακαήσομαι 1 Cor. iii. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 10 (from Aor. κατεκάην Her. 1, 51; 4, 79) for κατακαυθήσομαι Rev. xviii. 8, which the Attics use, see Thom. M. p. 511; Bttm. II. 211.

καταλείπω. 1st Aor. κατέλειψα Acts vi. 2; Lob. 714.

κεράννυμι. Perf. Pass. κεκέρασμαι Rev. xiv. 10, for the more usual κέκραμαι; see Bttm. II. 214. Analogous is the Participle συγκεκερασμένους Heb. iv. 2, in very good Codd.

κερδαίνω. Aor. ἐκέρδησα Matt. xxv. 20; xviii. 15, κερδῆσαι Acts. xxvii. 21, κερδήσας Luke ix. 25, κερδήσω Subj. 1 Cor. ix. 19, 20; Matt. xvi. 26 and frequently, forms peculiar to Ionic prose, Bttm. II. 215; Lob. 740. In Attic the verb is inflected regularly; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 21.

κλαίω. Fut. κλαύσω (properly Doric) for κλαύσομαι (as in Sept. always) Luke vi. 25; Jno. xvi. 20; Rev. xviii. 9; cf. Babr. 98, 9; Bttm. II. 85, 220.

κλέπτω. Fut. κλέψω for κλέψομαι Matt. xix. 18; Rom. xiii. 9, Bttm. II. 85, 221. In Sept. never, but in Lucian, dial. deor. 7, 4.

κράζω. Fut. κράξω Luke xix. 40 according to good authorities for κεκράξομαι (as always in Sept.), Aor. ἔκραξα for ἔκραγον Matt. 100 viii. 29; xx. 30, etc., Bttm. II. 223.

*κρέμαμαι. The form ἐξεκρέμετο Luke xix. 48 in Codd. B [and Sin.] of which Griesb. and Schulz take no notice, is undoubtedly a mistake of the transcriber. Lchm. also has not noticed it.

84 7th ed. *κρύπτω*. 2d Aor. Act. *ἔκρυβον* Luke i. 24 (Phot. bibliothec. I. p. 143, Bekk.), see Bttm. II. 226.

κύω (*to be pregnant*) has the Fut. and Aor. regular in the forms *κυήσω*, *ἐκύησα* (Bttm. II. 230). So Jas. i. 18 *ἀπεκύησε*. In the Pres. *κυέω* occurs, but not, as Eustath. p. 1548, 20 insists, only in the sense of *bring forth*; see Lob. Aiac. p. 182 sq. and paralip. 556.

81 6th ed. Hence in Jas. i. 15 *ἀποκυεῖ* may be written as well as *ἀποκύει*, but it is not necessary to prefer the former on account of the form of the Aorist in vs. 18. The N. T. Lexicons recognize only the form *κυέω*.

λάσκω. To this belongs the Aor. *ἐλάκησα* Acts i. 18, usually referred to the Doric Pres. *λακέω*; but Bttm. II. 233 derives it directly from the 2d Aor. *λακεῖν*, universally in use in Attic.

**μιαίνω* has Tit. i. 15, according to good Codd., in the Perf. Participle *μεμιαμμένοι* for the usual *μεμιασμένοι*, cf. Lob. 35.

νίπτω Jno. xiii. 6, 14, *νίπτομαι* Matt. xv. 2. Instead of this Pres. the earlier writers use *νίζω*; see Bttm. II. 249; Lob. 241.

οἰκτείρω. Fut. *οἰκτειρήσω* Rom. ix. 15 (as if from *οἰκτειρέω*) for *οἰκτερῶ*; cf. Ps. ci. 15; Jer. xxi. 7; Mic. vii. 19, etc.; also in the Byzantines, see Lob. 741.

ὀμνύω for *ὄμνυμι* (Bttm. II. 255) Matt. xxiii. 20 ff.; xxvi. 74; Heb. vi. 16; Jas. v. 12. But in the better MSS. we find Mark xiv. 71 *ὀμνύναι* for *ὀμνύειν*, and Griesb. received it into the text.

**ὁράω*. Imperf. Mid. *ὡρώμην* Acts ii. 25 (from Ps. xvi.), for which *ἐωρώμην* was used in Attic (Bttm. I. 325). From *ὄπτεσθαι* we find Luke xiii. 28, though not without var., the 1st Aor. Subj. *ὄψησθε*, which occurs in Liban. and the Byzantines; see Lob. 734.

παίζω. Aor. *ἐνέπαιξα* Matt. xx. 19; xxvii. 31 (Sept. Prov. xxiii. 35), for which in Attic *ἔπαισα* was used; see Bttm. I. 372. But *ἔπαιξα*, *παῖξαι* Lucian, dial. deor. 6, 4, and encom. Demosth. 15; cf. V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 378; and Lob. 240. The Fut. *παίξω* Anacr. 24, 8.

πέτομαι. Part. *πετώμενον* Rev. xiv. 6 in B for *πετόμενον*, from the form *πετάομαι* which occurs only in Ionic (Her. 3, 111) and later writers (e.g. Lucian, dial. mort. 15, 3 var.), see Bttm. II. 271. The Pres. *πέταμαι*, found even in Pindar, is cited by Wetst. and Matthäi among the var. Rev. xii. 14.

101 *πίνω*. From the Fut. *πίομαι* the complete form *πίεσαι* is established in Luke xvii. 8 (Bttm. I. 347), as in the very same passage *φάγεσαι* from *φάγομαι*. Both are found also in Ezek. xii. 18; Ruth ii. 9, 14. On the Inf. *πῖν* Jno. iv. 9, which on the

authority of good Codd. [also Sin.*] Lchm. and Tdf. [ed. II.] have inserted in the text, see Fr. de crit. conformat. etc. p. 27 sq. Only the form *πεῖν* is found in later writers, and this reading of several 85
Codd. [and Tdf. ed. VII.] might perhaps be adopted, if at least 7th ed.
Cod. A vs. 7, 10 had not distinctly *πιεῖν*, thus showing *πῖν* vs. 9 to be a mistake of the transcriber.

πίπτω. Aor. *ἔπεσα*, see § 13, 1 p. 73.

ῥέω. Fut. *ῥεύσω* Jno. vii. 38 for *ῥεύσομαι*. In Attic, however, *ῥυήσομαι* is the usual form, Lob. 739; Bttm. II. 287. (As to the 1st Aor. *ῥευσάτωσαν* Cant. iv. 16, also used only in later Greek, cf. Lob. 739.) The regular and usual 2d Aor. *ἐῤῥύην* occurs in the compound *παραρυῶμεν* Heb. ii. 1.

σαλπίζω. Fut. *σαλπίσω* for *σαλπίγξω* 1 Cor. xv. 52, cf. also 82
Mechan. vett. p. 201 (Num. x. 3; also 1st Aor. *ἐσάλπισα* for 6th ed.
ἐσάλπιγξα Xen. An. 1, 2, 17 is frequent in Sept.), see Phryn. 191; Thom. M. p. 789.

σημαίνω. 1st Aor. *ἐσήμανα* Acts xi. 28; xxv. 27 (Judg. vii. 21; Esth. ii. 22; Plutarch, Aristid. 19; Menandri Byz. hist. pp. 308, 309, 358; Act. Thom. p. 32), which is found indeed even in Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 28, but for which in early Attic *ἐσήμηνα* was the usual form, see Bttm. I. 438; Lob. 24. Cf. under *φαίνω*.

σκέπτομαι. The Pres. (Heb. ii. 6; Jas. i. 27; cf. Ps. viii. 5; 1 Sam. xi. 8; xv. 4, etc.) and Imperf. occur but seldom in Attic, Bttm. II. 291.

**σπουδάζω*. Fut. *σπουδάσω* for the usual *σπουδάσομαι* 2 Pet. i. 15; Bttm. II. 85.

στηρίζω. Imperat. Aor. according to good Codd. is *στήρισον* Luke xxii. 32; Rev. iii. 2, and Fut. 2 Thess. iii. 3 in B *στηρίσει*, instead of the forms preferred by Greek authors, *στήριξον* and *στηρίξει*, Bttm. I. 372; cf. Judg. xix. 5; Ezek. xx. 46, and often; also *ἐστήρισα* 1 Macc. xiv. 14, etc.

τυγχάνω. Of the Perf. we find Heb. viii. 6 in text. rec. the (properly Ionic, then Attic, Bttm. II. 301) form *τέτευχε*; but in other Codd. the usual Attic *τετύχηκε*, and in A D [Sin.*] et al. *τέτυχε*. On the latter see Lob. 395.

φαγεῖν. Fut. *φάγομαι* Jas. v. 3; Rev. xvii. 16 [Jno. ii. 17] (Gen. xxvii. 25; Exod. xii. 8, etc.), whence 2d Per. *φάγεσαι* Luke xvii. 8. For this Greek authors use *ἔδομαι* from *ἔδω*, Bttm. II. 185.

φαίνω. 1st Aor. Inf. *ἐπιφᾶναι* (*ἐπιφῆναι*) Luke i. 79, contrary to the best usage. In later Greek, however, similar forms occur; Lob. 26; Thilo, Acta Thom. 49 sq. (Aelian, anim. 2, 11; and epil. 102
p. 396, Jac.).

φαύσκω. Hence ἐπιφαύσει Eph. v. 14; cf. Gen. xliv. 3; Judg. xvi. 2; 1 Sam. xiv. 36; Judith xiv. 2. As to the analogical proof of this form, not found in Greek authors, by means of the Subs. ὑπόφαυσις, see Bttm. II. 312.

*φέρω. Aor. Partic. ἐνέγκας Acts v. 2; xiv. 13 (ἐνέγκαντες Luke xv. 23 var.) for ἐνεγκών Bttm. II. 313; yet see Xen. M. 1, 2, 53;
86 Demosth. Timoth. 703 c.; Isocr. paneg. 40. The Indic. ἤνεγκα
7th ed. occurs frequently in Attic, as also the Imperat. forms with α Jno. xxi. 10.

*θάνω. According to several Atticists the 2d Aor. ἔφθην is to be preferred to the 1st Aor. ἔφθασα, which, however, often occurs even in Attic writers (Bttm. II. 316), and prevails in the N. T. Matt. xii. 28; Rom. ix. 31; 2 Cor. x. 14; Phil. iii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 16. In the last passage several Codd. have the Perf. ἔφθακε.

φύω. 2d Aor. Pass. ἐφύην, φυείς Luke viii. 6, 7, 8 (since Hippocrat. very much used), for which the Attics employ the 2d Aor. Act. ἔφυν, φύς; see Bttm. II. 321. In Matt. xxiv. 32 and Mark xiii. 28 very good Codd. have ἐκφυῇ (Aor. Pass. Subj.) for ἐκφύῃ; and the former reading may be regarded as preferable; see Fr. Marc. 578 sq.

83 χαίρω. Fut. χαρήσομαι for χαιρήσω Luke i. 14; Jno. xvi. 20,
6th ed. 22; Phil. i. 18 (Hab. i. 16; Zech. x. 7; Ps. xcv. 12, and often), see Moer. 120; Thom. Mag. 910; Lob. 740; Bttm. II. 322. It occurs also Diod. Exc. Vat. p. 95.

*χαρίζομαι. Fut. χαρίσομαι Rom. viii. 32 is the non-Attic form for χαριοῦμαι.

ὠθέω. Aor. ἀπώσατο[1] Acts vii. 27, 39 (Mic. iv. 6; Lam. ii. 7 and often, Dion. H. II. 759), for which the better writers used ἐώσατο with syllabic augment (Thom. M. p. 403; Pol. 2, 69, 9; 15, 31, 12). 1st Aor. Pass. ἀπώσθην Ps. lxxxvii. 6; cf. Xen. Hell. 4, 3, 12; Dio C. 37, 47. Also Aor. Act. ἐξῶσεν Acts vii. 45 for which some Codd. have ἐξέωσεν (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 181). That remark, however, respecting the syll. augm. holds strictly only of the Attic authors; see Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 407.

*ὠνέομαι. 1st Aor. ὠνησάμην Acts vii. 16, as frequently in writers of the κοινή (e.g. Plut., Pausan.), Lob. 139. In Attic ἐπριάμην is preferred.

Note. The later verbal forms are not always used in the N. T. where
103 they might be expected. We find for instance πίομαι 2d Fut. from πίνω.

[1] After the Fut. ὤσω (from ὤθω). The Aorist form from the other Fut. ὠθήσω occurs only in later authors, as e.g. the Particip. εἰσωθήσας in Cinnam. p. 193.

and not πιοῦμαι Rev. xiv. 10 (see Bttm. I. 395); Aor. κοινῶσαι Mark vii. 15, 18 etc.; Moeris, ed. Piers. p. 434; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 254; Fut. φεύξομαι, θαυμάσομαι, and not φεύξω, θαυμάσω (Bttm. II. 85). Among the various readings occurs Heb. iv. 15 πεπειραμένον from the older form πειράω instead of πεπειρασμένον from πειράζω; the former Tdf. has received into the text.

That the same forms sometimes come by inflection from entirely different verbs is well known; we shall only specify ἐξένευσε Jno. v. 13, which grammatically may come equally from ἐκνέω (Bttm. II. 248) and from ἐκνεύω.

§ 16. FORMATION OF WORDS.[1]

The N. T. contains a number of words never occurring in Greek 87
authors, but borrowed from the spoken language of the time, and 7th ed.
in part new formations (particularly in the writings of Paul). The greater the number of these peculiar forms, the more necessary it becomes to compare them with the established principles of Greek derivation (from stems). In doing this, it will be instructive to note analogies not altogether unknown to Greek authors, but 84
far more prominent in the idiom of the N. T. Our remarks will be 6th ed.
founded on the luminous exposition of Bttm., which comprehends whatever is of essential importance (II. § 118 ff.), cf. Krü. § 41 ff.

1. A. Derivation by Terminations. a. Verbs: Of derivative verbs (mostly but not entirely from nouns) those in οω and ιζω are peculiarly frequent. Forms in οω partly superseded those in ενω or ιζω; as, δεκατόω (δεκατεύω Xen. An. 5, 3, 9, etc.), ἐξουδενόω (ἐξουδενίζω in Plutarch, yet see in general Lob. 182), σαρόω (for σαίρω Lob. 89), κεφαλαιόω (κεφαλίζω Lob. 95), δυναμόω and ἐνδυναμόω (Lob. 605, note), ἀφυπνόω (ἀφυπνίζω Lob. 224), 104
ἀνακαινόω (ἀνακαινίζω Isocr. Areop. c. 3), besides μεστόω, δολιόω. From δεκατόω comes ἀποδεκατόω; with ἀφυπνόω compare καθυπνόω Xen. M. 2, 1, 30. Κραταιόω occurs also for κρατύνω, σθενόω for σθενέω, ἀναστατοῦν for ἀνάστατον ποιεῖν; but χαριτόω is formed from χάρις, δυνατόω from δύναμις (Lob. Phryn. 605).

Verbs in ιζω come from the most diverse stems: ὀρθρίζω from ὄρθρος, αἰχμαλωτίζω from αἰχμάλωτος, δειγματίζω from δεῖγμα,

[1] See *Ph. Cattieri*, Gazophylacium Graecor. (1651, 1708) ed. *F. L. Abresch* (Utr. 1757) L. B. 1809, 8vo., but especially *Bttm.* ausf. Gr. II. 382 ff. (with *Lobeck's* additions), *Lobeck*, Parerga to Phryn., and his other works referred to above, p. 3. Among expository works we must mention chiefly Selecta e Scholis *Valckenarii*. Specimens of later formations are to be found especially in the Byzantine authors.

πελεκίζω from πέλεκυς, μυκτηρίζω from μυκτήρ, σμιρνίζω, ἀνεμίζω, φυλακίζω, ἱματίζω, ἀναθεματίζω (also in Byzantine authors), θεατρίζω (Cinnam. p. 213), σπλαγχνίζομαι, αἱρετίζω, συμμορφίζω (Phil. iii. 10 according to good Codd.). Σκορπίζω (διασκορπίζω) has no distinct stem in the Greek literary language; it was, however, a provincial, perhaps a Macedonic, form (Lob. 218).

As to verbs in ιζω from names of nations and persons, see Bttm. II. 385. We have only to mention ἰουδαΐζω, with which compare the later word δαυϊδίζω, Leo Gram. p. 447.

There are also a few verbs in αζω seldom or never occurring elsewhere, e.g. νηπιάζω, σινιάζω (σήθω).

88 Also in ευω, as μεσιτεύω, μαγεύω, ἐγκρατεύομαι, αἰχμαλωτεύω
7th ed. (Lob. 442), παγιδεύω, γυμνητεύω. The last is from γυμνήτης, which, according to Bttm. II. 431, is only to be vindicated as a collateral form of γυμνής. From γυμνός, on the other hand, one would expect γυμνίτης, and accordingly the best Codd. [Sin. also] have 1 Cor. iv. 11 γυμνιτεύω, which therefore we must not, with Fr. (conform. crit. p. 21) and Mey., take for an error of the copyist.[1]

Among verbs in υνω, which signify a rendering what the (concrete) root denotes (as ἱλαρύνειν, i.e. ἱλαρὸν ποιεῖν) Bttm. II. 387, σκληρύνω is to be noticed as a collateral form of σκληρόω, which never occurs in the N. T.

Verbs in αινω (λευκαίνω, ξηραίνω, εὐφραίνω Bttm. II. 65 f.; Lob. prolegg. pathol. 37) require no special remark.

The formation of verbs in θω, from primitives in εω, which is not unknown in Attic (Bttm. II. 61; Lob. 151), seems to have
85 been practised more frequently in later Greek; νήθω, κνήθω, ἀλήθω,
6th ed. are not used at least by the earlier writers. Yet cf. Lob. 254.

Verbs in σκω (except εὑρίσκω and διδάσκω) are rare even in
105 the N. T. (Bttm. II. 59 f.). We find γηράσκω as an inchoative (Bttm. II. 393), but μεθύσκω, causative from μεθύω, only in the Pass. Γαμίσκω, equivalent to γαμίζω, is sufficiently attested only in Luke xx. 34. Lastly, we note as altogether singular in formation γρηγορέω (from the Perf. ἐγρήγορα), with its cognate ἐγρηγορέω, Lob. 119; Bttm. II. 158. With this verb,[2] derived from a reduplicated Perfect, may be compared, however, ἐπικεχειρέω Papyri Taurin. 7, lin. 7.

[1] Cf. *Lob.* Soph. Ai. p. 387. Ὀλοθρεύω Heb. xi. 28 is, in some good Codd., written ὀλεθρεύω (from ὄλεθρος), and *Lchm.*, and with him *Tdf.*, has so printed. I am not aware that the latter form of this Alexandrian word has been preserved anywhere else.

[2] *Döderlein* on reduplication in Greek and Latin derivation in his Reden und Aufsätze II. no. 2.

To derivative verbs in *ευω* belongs also *παραβολεύεσθαι* Phil. ii. 30, (which Griesb., Lchm., and others, agreeably to the weightiest critical evidence, have admitted into the text). From *παράβολος* might have been formed most naturally *παραβολεῖσθαι*; but the termination *ευω* was selected to make the verb signify *παράβολον εἶναι*, as *ἐπισκοπεύειν* in later Greek denotes *ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι* (Lob. 591), and, what is more to the purpose, there is *περπερεύεσθαι* from *πέρπερος*. It would be unwarrantable to grant admission to *παραβολεύεσθαι* only on the assumption of a simple verb *βολεύεσθαι*, (which certainly does not occur).

2. b. SUBSTANTIVES:[1] Derived *a. from Verbs* (cf. Lob. paralip. p. 397 sqq. and particularly lib. 3 of technologia p. 253 sqq.).

With the termination *μος* (Bttm. II. 398) from a verb in *αζω* is to be noted *ἁγιασμός* which does not occur in Greek authors, like *πειρασμός* from *πειράζω*, *ἐνταφιασμός* from *ἐνταφιάζω*; from verbs in *ιζω* we find *μακαρισμός*, *ὀνειδισμός* (Lob. 551), *βασανισμός*, 89
παροργισμός, *ῥαντισμός* (*ῥαντίζειν*), *σαββατισμός* (*σαββατίζειν*), 7th ed.
σωφρονισμός, *ἀπελεγμός*.

The most numerous formations, however, are those in *μα* (Lob. as above 391 sqq.) and *σις*, the former mostly confined to the N. T. yet always conformed to Greek analogy; as, *βάπτισμα*, *ῥάπισμα* from *βαπτίζειν* etc., *ψεῦσμα* from *ψεύδεσθαι*, *ἱεράτευμα*, *κατάλυμα* (*καταλύειν*), also *ἐξέραμα* (Lob. 64), *ἀσθένημα*, *ἄντλημα*, *ἀντάλλαγμα*, *ἀποσκίασμα*, *πρόσκομμα*, *ἀπαύγασμα*, *ἥττημα*, *αἴτημα*, *κατόρθωμα*, *στερέωμα* from contract verbs (like *φρόνημα*, etc.), mostly in the sense of product or state. Only *ἄντλημα* denotes an implement (as substantives in *μος* often do), and *κατάλυμα* the place of *καταλύειν* (Eustath. Odyss. p. 146, 33).

Substantives in *σις*, particularly numerous in the Epistle to the 106
Hebrews, nearly all belong to literary Greek. Only *θέλησις*, *κατάπαυσις*, *πρόσχυσις*,[2] *ἀπολύτρωσις*, *δικαίωσις*, *βίωσις*, *πεποίθησις* Lob. 295 (*ἐπιπόθησις*) require notice. As to *παρασκευή*, formed from the stem of a verb in *αζω*, see Bttm. II. 404. As to *οἰκοδομή*, see Lob. 490. As to the very common *διαθήκη* (from 1st Aor. of 86
τιθέναι), see Bttm. II. 401; Lob. paralip. 374. 6th ed.

Among abstract nouns from verbs are some in *μονή*. We find in the N. T. *πλησμονή* Bttm. II. 405. On the contrary, *ἐπιλησμονή* comes directly from *ἐπιλήσμων*. *Πεισμονή*, however (also in

[1] Cf. *G. Curtius*, de nomin. gr. formatione linguar. cognat. ratione habita. Berol. 1842 (Zeitschr. f. Alterth. 1846, no. 68 f.).

[2] The form *χυσια* appears to have been employed only in words compounded with other nouns. Compare the N. T. word *αἱματεκχυσία* (Leo Gramm. p. 287) with *αἱματοχυσία* (Theophan. p. 510), *φωτοχυσία* and *ῥινεγχυσία*.

Pachym. II. 100 and 120), is another form of πεῖσμα, though πεισμονή may be referred directly to πείθω, as πλησμονή to πλήθω. Among abstract nouns in the N. T. derived from verbs in ευω must be mentioned ἐριθεία.[1]

Verbal nouns with a *concrete* signification present little that is peculiar. From verbs in αζω, ιζω, υζω, we find in the N. T. κτίστης (paroxyt.) and the oxytones (Bttm. II. 408) βιαστής, βαπτιστής, μεριστής, εὐαγγελιστής, γογγυστής, and ἑλληνιστής,[2] forms rare or
90 unknown elsewhere. Only κολλυβιστής, (which is not peculiar
7th ed. however to the N. T.), cannot be traced to a verb κολλυβίζειν. From τελειοῦν we have τελειωτής (cf. ζηλωτής and λυτρωτής). From προσκυνεῖν comes προσκυνητής (Constant. Man. 4670). On ἐπενδύτης see Bttm. II. 411. The earlier writers prefer διωκτήρ to διώκτης; just as δότης appears as a secondary form by the side of δοτήρ.

Very strange would be the formation of κατάνυξις from κατανυστάζω Rom. xi. 8 (from Sept.) as was formerly supposed. But its connection with κατανύσσειν is evident from Dan. x. 9, Theod., and thus it very probably denotes *stupefaction* (תַּרְדֵּמָה Ps. lx. 5), and thence *torpor;* see Fr. Excur. Rom. II. 558 sqq.

107 From careless pronunciation arose the form ταμεῖον, as all good Codd. have Luke xii. 24 and many Codd. have Matt. vi. 6, for ταμιεῖον (from ταμιεύω) see Lob. Phryn. 493 and paralip. 28, and the compound γλωσσόκομον for γλωσσοκομεῖον or γλωσσοκόμιον (from κομέω) without var., see Lob. 98 sq.

β. From Adjectives. Under this head come,

Various abstract nouns in της, οτης, as ἁγιότης, ἁγνότης, ἀδελφότης (Leo Gramm. p. 464), ἁδρότης, ἁπλότης, ἱκανότης, ἀφελότης (ἀφέλεια in earlier authors), σκληρότης, τιμιότης, τελειότης, ματαιότης, γυμνότης, μεγαλειότης, κυριότης, αἰσχρότης, πιότης (ἀγαθότης Sept.), see Lob. 350 sqq. (ἀκαθάρτης Rev. xvii. 4 is not well attested);

[1] The connection of ἐριθεία with ἔρις is not prevented by the θ alone (for that occurs in the cognates ἐρέθειν, ἐρεθίζειν), but its whole structure is such that it can only be referred to ἐριθεύω. But *Fr.* Rom. I. 143 sqq. has satisfactorily shown that ἐριθεία even in the N. T. is nothing else than the ἐριθεία, *labor for wages*, already known to the Greeks. Among earlier writers see *Stolberg*, de soloec. N. T. p. 136 sqq.

[2] Ἑλληνίζειν signifies in general *to comport one's self as a Greek* (Diog. L. I. 102), and most usually *to speak Greek*, especially of foreigners, Strabo 14, 662; then often it has no unfavorable secondary meaning, (erroneously *de Wette*, Bibel, reprinted from the Hall. Encycl. S. 17), Xen. A. 7, 3, 25; Strabo 2, 98. Ἑλληνιστής, therefore, — a substantive which never occurs in Greek authors, — means very naturally *a Greek-speaking non-Greek* (e.g. a Jew). That in Christian Greek phraseology ἑλληνίζειν also signifies *to be a heathen* (e.g. in Malalas p. 449) is a fact lying beyond our present inquiry.

And such substantives in *συνη* (denoting mental qualities) as *ἐλεημοσύνη* and *ἀσχημοσύνη* (from *ἐλεήμων* and *ἀσχήμων*, cf. *σωφροσύνη* from *σώφρων*), or *ἁγιωσύνη*, *ἀγαθωσύνη*, *ἱερωσύνη*, *μεγαλωσύνη*, with *ω*, because the penult of the adjectives is short (Etym. M. p. 275, 44) [1] — all later words found only in Hellenistic writers; cf. in general Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 235 sqq. 87 6th ed.

Also among those in *ια* which come from adjectives in *ος*, *ρος* (Bttm, II. 415) are many later formations (Lob. 343); as, *ἐλαφρία* (like *αἰσχρία* in Eustath. from *αἰσχρός*); and as *εὐδαιμονία* from *εὐδαίμων*, so 2 Pet. ii. 16 *παραφρονία* from *παράφρων* (Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 238); some Codd., however, have the more usual *παραφροσύνη*.[2]

Lastly, we often find Neuters of adjectives in *ιος* used as substantives; as, *ὑποζύγιον*, *μεθόριον*, *ὑπολήνιον*, *σφάγιον* (*προσφάγιον*), etc., see Fr. Prälimin. S. 42.

γ. From other Substantives (Bttm. II. 420 ff.) are derived *εἰδωλεῖον* (*εἴδωλον*), *ἐλαιών* (*ἐλαία*), *μυλών* Matt. xxiv. 41 var. (*μύλος*, *μύλη*) Bttm. II. 422 f. and the Fem. *βασίλισσα* (Bttm. II. 427). *Ἀφεδρών*, peculiar to the N. T., comes from *ἕδρα*. The Gentile Fem. from *Φοίνιξ* is *Φοίνισσα*; therefore also Mark vii. 26 *Συροφοίνισσα*, as from *Κίλιξ* comes *Κίλισσα* (Bttm. II. 427). Perhaps, however, the Fem. was also formed from the name of the country *Φοινίκη*; for, a large number of good Codd. [Sin. also] have in the above passage in Mark *Συροφοινίκισσα*, cf. Fritzsche, and this might come directly from an original form *Φοινικίς*, as *βασίλισσα* is connected with *βασιλίς*, and, at least among the Romans, Scythissa occurs for *Σκυθίς*, or in later Greek *φυλάκισσα* by the side of *φυλακίς*. See in general Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 413 sqq. 91 7th ed. 108

To the later and Latinizing formation belong, of Gentile and Patronymic nouns, *Ἡρωδιανός* Matt. xxii. 16 and *Χριστιανός* Acts xi. 26, etc. (cf. *Καισαριανός* Arrian. Epict. 1, 19, 19; 3, 24, 117). In the earlier language, the termination *ανος* was employed only in forming Gentile names from cities and countries not Greek; Bttm. II. 429.

[1] Yet in Glycas, p. 11, even in the later edition, *μεγαλοσύνη* is printed. *Bttm.* II. 420, shows that nearly all substantives in *ωσύνη* belong to the later language. On the termination *συνη* in general, see *Aufrecht* in the Berl. Zeitschr. f. vergleich. Sprachforsch. 6 Heft; [and on the termination *τητς* *G. Bühler*, das griech. Secundärsuffix *τητς*. Ein Beitrag z. Lehre v. d. Wortbildung. Gött. 1858. 8vo.].

[2] Of substantives derived from adjectives in *ης*, some, as is well known, end in *ια* instead of *εια* (*Bttm.* II. 416). In others, the spelling varies between *ια* and *εια*, as in *κακοπαθία* (cf. *Poppo*, Thuc. II. I. 154. *Ellendt*, praef. ad Arrian. p. 30 sqq. *Weber*, Demosth. p. 511). In regard to this word, however, the preponderance is for *εια*.

Among Diminutives deserves to be mentioned *βιβλαρίδιον*, primarily from *βιβλάριον*, quoted by Pollux, instead of the older forms *βιβλίδιον* and *βιβλιδάριον* (like *ἱματιδάριον* from *ἱματίδιον*), Lob. pathol. 281. *Γυναικάριον* follows the usual analogy, but seems to have been of rare occurrence in Greek authors; the same may be said of *ὠτάριον* Mark xiv. 47; Jno. xviii. 10, *κλινάριον*, *παιδάριον*. On diminutives in *ιον* (of which *ψιχίον* is unquestionably a later form), see Fr. Prälim. S. 43, and a dissertation De vocib. in *ίον* trisyllabis by Janson in Jahn's Archiv VII. 485 ff.

Substantives in *ηριον* are properly Neuters of adjectives (Bttm. II. 412 f.); as, *ἱλαστήριον*, *θυμιατήριον*, *φυλακτήριον*. (Such become still more numerous in later writers, e.g. *ἀνακαλυπτήριον* Niceph. Gregor. p. 667, *δεητήριον*
88 Cedren. II. 377, *θανατήριον* ibid. I. 679, *ἰαματήριον* I. 190, etc.) *Φυλα-*
6th ed. *κτήριος*, directly from *φυλακτήρ*, has like it an active meaning — *guarding, protecting*. *Ἱλαστήριον* properly signifies *something that propitiates*, but may be applied to the place where the propitiation is accomplished (just as *φυλακτήριον* denotes *a guard-post*), and consequently to the cover of the ark of the covenant. In Rom. iii. 25 the signification *propitiatory offering* (Index to Theoph. contin.) is equally appropriate, which Philippi without sufficient reason has recently denied. A Fem. subst. of the same sort is *ζευκτηρία* (cf. *στυπτηρία*). *Σωτηρία* is connected immediately with *σωτήρ*; side by side with it occurs *σωτήριον* also as a substantive. *Ὑπερῷον*, that is *ὑπερῶϊον*, is to be regarded in like manner as a Neuter from *ὑπερῶϊος*, which, like *πατρῷος* from *πατήρ*, is formed from the preposition *ὑπέρ*, for there is no intermediate adjective *ὔπερος*.

109 3. c. Adjectives: *a*. To adjectives derived directly from a *verbal* root belongs the fully established *πειθός* 1 Cor. ii. 4; cf. *ἐδός* from *ἔδω*, *βοσκός* from *βόσκω*, *φειδός* from (*φείδω*) *φείδομαι* (Lob. Phryn. p. 434). These derivatives are all oxytones, *φάγος* alone occurring in the grammarians as also a paroxytone (Lob. paralip. 135), and it is written as such in the N. T.

Among those in *ωλός*, *ἁμαρτωλός* is the most frequent (Bttm. II. 448). To be referred to the same formation, however, is *εἴδωλον*
92 Neut. from *εἴδωλος* (Lob. pathol. p. 134).
7th ed. Verbals in *τος* (Bttm. I. 443 ff.; Lob. paralip. 478 sq.; Moiszisstzig, de adject. graec. verbal. Conitz 1844, 4to.) correspond in signification, sometimes to the Latin participle in *tus*, as *γνωστός notus*, *σιτευτός saginatus*, *ἀπαίδευτος* (*untrained, awkward*) cf. *θεόπνευστος inspiratus*[1]; sometimes to adjectives in *bilis*, as *ὁρατός*,

[1] That this word in 2 Tim. iii. 16 is to be taken in a passive sense, there can be no doubt; this acceptation is confirmed by *ἔμπνευστος*, though several derivatives of the same class have an *active* signification, as *εὔπνευστος*, *ἄπνευστος*.

δυσβάστακτος, ἀνεκτός, ἀκατάσχετος, ἀκαταπαυστός, ἀνεκδιήγητος, ἀνεκλάλητος; sometimes they have an active meaning (Fr. Rom. II. 185), as ἄπταιστος *not stumbling*, i.e. not sinning (certainly, however, not ἀλάλητος Rom. viii. 26).

Ἀπείραστος (like the ἀπείρατος usual in Greek authors) means either *untempted*, or *that cannot be tempted;* both amount to the same thing in Jas. i. 13. Only παθητός Acts xxvi. 23, signifies *who is to suffer;* cf. φευκτός, πρακτός Aristot. de anima 3, 9, p. 64 Sylb.; Cattier. gazophyl. p. 34. The verbal προσήλυτος, akin to the forms ἔπηλυς, μέτηλυς, is an extended formation of which no example is to be found in classic Greek.

β. Among adjectives derived from *other adjectives* (or participles) a few are deserving of special notice. Such are περιούσιος, ἐπιούσιος, like ἑκούσιος, ἐθελούσιος (Lob. Phryn. p. 4 sq.), which are extended formations from ἑκών and ἐθέλων like the feminines ἑκοῦσα, ἐθελοῦσα; but ἐπιούσιος [according to Leo Meyer, in Kuhn's Ztschr. für vergleichende Sprachforschung. Bd. VII. Berl. 1858. pp. 424 sq. 428, formed by means of the suffix ιο from ἐπί and ὄντ, and that denoting "what is ἐπί," so that ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος signifies "bread that is serviceable, or suited, or necessary for life, for subsistence, that which answers our needs, is adequate for them"] has probably direct relation to the Fem. (ἡ) ἐπιοῦσα sc. ἡμέρα, and accordingly ἄρτος ἐπιούσιος means *bread for the following day*, cf. Stolberg, diss. de pane ἐπιουσίῳ in his tractat. de soloecism. N. T. p. 220 sqq.; Valcken. Select. I. 190; Fr. ad Mt. p. 267 sq. (also against the derivation from οὐσία, which would be grammatically 89
possible, cf. ἐνούσιος). Besides, περιούσιος in the Bible does not 6th ed
mean simply *proprius*, in opposition to what belongs to a stranger, any more than περιουσιασμός in the Sept. means *property* merely.

Πιστικός (Mark xiv. 3; Jno. xii. 3) from πιστός, according to 110
several ancient expositors equivalent to *genuine*. In classic authors the word signifies *convincing*, probably also *persuasive* (Plat. Gorg. 455 a.; Diog. L. 4, 37; Dion. H. V. 631; Sext. Emp. Math. 2, 71; Theophrast. metaph. 253 Sylb.), though in nearly all the passages Codd. have πειστικός, and critics have usually given this the preference (see Bekker and Stallb. on Plato, as above; cf. Lob. Soph. Ai. v. 151); in later writers *faithful*, *trustworthy*, of persons (Lücke, Joh. II. 496; see Index to Cedren. p. 950). The tran- 93
sition to the signification *genuine* as the predicate of a material 7th ed.
object, is not impossible, particularly when it is considered that technical expressions (such as νάρδος πιστική may be), and espec-

ially mercantile terms, are often strange.[1] Others, after Casaubon, take πιστικός for *drinkable* (Fr. Mr. 598 sqq.) from πιπίσκω or the root πίω, like πιστός *drinkable* Aeschyl. Prom. 480, πιστήρ, πίστρα, πίστρον, etc., quoted in old Lexicons. That the ancients drank oil of spikenard, we are told by Athenæus 15, 689. I cannot, however, quite understand why both Evangelists subjoined *this* epithet; if the thin, liquid nard used for pouring out (Mark καταχέειν) in no respect differed from what was drunk, it would have been just as superfluous to add the epithet πιστ. as to call nard *fluid*. The νάρδος λεπτή of Dioscorides, however, means *fluid* nard, as opposed to *thick*, *viscid* nard. Besides, the *drinkable* nard would not be suited to the manipulation indicated by ἀλείφειν in John. Lastly, Fritzsche's translation of πιστ. (ad Mr. p. 601), "qui *facile* bibi potest, *lubenter* bibitur," does not appear to be sufficiently established, not to mention that πιστικός cannot be positively shown to have signified *drinkable*. Even πιστός itself was not much in use (in Aeschyl. it occurs in a pun), and was superseded by the unambiguous ποτός, πόσιμος.

γ. To adjectives derived from *substantives* belong, among others, σάρκινος and σαρκικός. The former means *fleshy* 2 Cor. iii. 3 (as pro-paroxytone adjectives in ινος almost without exception denote the material of which a thing is made, e.g. λίθινος *of stone* 2 Cor. iii. 3, ξύλινος *wooden*, πήλινος *of clay*, ἀκάνθινος, βύσσινος, etc., Bttm. II. 448), the latter (σαρκικός) means *fleshly*. There is,
111 however, in Rom. vii. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 1 (2 Cor. i. 12); Heb. vii. 16, where one might have expected σαρκικός, preponderating or respec-
90 table authority for σάρκινος, and even Lchm. has placed it in the
6th ed. text. But how easily might σαρκικός, which does not occur outside of the N. T., be confounded in the Codd. with the very common σάρκινος (Fr. Rom. II. 46 sq.)! Had Paul, however, written σάρκινος, he must have intended some peculiar emphasis, somewhat in the way that Mey., 1 Cor. as above, insists upon. But on the one hand, a notion of the natural man for which only the material term σάρκινος would be adequate finds no sanction in the doctrinal teaching of Paul, while σαρκικός, as opposed to πνευματικός, fully meets the demands even of the text in question; and on the other

[1] They have in particular this peculiarity, that words elsewhere used only of persons are transferred to articles of merchandise. Compare *flat*, properly equivalent to feeble, and the expressions, "Sugar dull — wheat unasked for." *Lob.* paralip. 31 upholds *Scaliger's* derivation from πτίσσω (*Fr.* Mr. p. 595), as τ after π elsewhere also for euphony's sake is thrown away (cf. πτέρνιξ, πέρνιξ, but particularly πίτυρον and the Latin *pisso*). Mey. has not been induced to abandon the interpretation *genuine*.

hand, 1 Cor. iii. 3, taken in connection with 2, shows that in both passages Paul employed the same expression. In the passage from Heb. (vii. 16) ἐντολὴ σαρκίνη is hardly admissible.[1] 94 7.L ed.

Among oxytone adjectives in ινος, expressing a notion of *time* (Bttm. II. 448), are καθημερινός, ὀρθρινός, πρωϊνός, later forms for which earlier authors used καθημέριος, etc. The like holds true of ταχινός.

Some adjectives derived from substantives end in ειν(ός; as, σκοτεινός, φωτεινός. But ἐλεεινός (a form not unfrequent in Attic also V. Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 456) comes from the verb ἐλεέω, as ποθεινός from ποθέω (Bttm. II. 448).

To the later adjectival formations specially belongs κεραμικός (κεράμειος, κεράμιος).

Among adverbs derived from verbs φειδομένως seems to be peculiar to the N. T.

4. B. Derivation by Composition. a. The N. T. contains numerous compound substantives whose *first part* also is a *substantive*. Although many of these compounds, however, cannot be shown to have existed in the written language of the Greeks, yet in their formation there is nothing noticeably at variance with analogy. Compare in particular δικαιοκρισία (Leo Gr. p. 163), αἱματεκχυσία, ταπεινόφρων (like εὐσεβόφρων, κραταιόφρων Constant. Porphyr. II. 33, by later authors even ἰουδαιόφρων, ἑλληνόφρων Cedren. I. 660; Theoph. I. 149) and ταπεινοφροσύνη (cf. ματαιοφροσύνη Constant. Man. 657), σκληροκαρδία, σκληροτράχηλος (from which we find σκληροτραχηλία and σκληροτραχηλιᾶν in Constant. Man.), ἀκροβυστία,[2] ἀκρογωνιαῖος, ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος (cf. ἀλλο-

[1] It might perhaps be assumed in general that the later popular Greek interchanged these forms, and used σάρκινος also in the sense of σαρκικός: especially as not *all* adjectives in ινος signify the material of which a thing is made, cf. ἀνθρώπινος (see *Fr.* Rom. II. 47; *Tholuck*, Hebr.-Br. 301 f.). Somewhat similar in German is the expression das *Inwendige* of man for das *Innere*. The former had originally a more restricted meaning. Since, however, the term σαρκικός had already established itself undeniably in the language of the N. T., the above assumption loses here all foundation.

[2] Wenn dieses Wort anders von βύζω, βύω mit Etymol. m. abzuleiten ist, was neuerlich *Fr.* Rom. I. 136 bestritten hat, theils weil βύω nicht scheine *tegere* geheissen zu haben (wie bei dieser Etymologie angenommen wird), theils weil das Wort nicht bestimmt das Glied bezeichne, dessen Extremität bedeckt sei, also nicht verstanden worden sein würde. Jener erste Grund scheint mir durchgreifender als der zweite. Ich möchte aber glauben, dass ἀκροβυστία nicht eine absichtslose Umbildung des griech. ἀκροποσθία, sondern geflissentliche Umgestaltung sei, welche aus Schaam die Sache verdeckt ausdrücken sollte: ἀκρόβυστος *vorn* (an der Spitze) *strotzend* von Unbeschnittenen im Gegensatz der Beschnittenen, deren vorderes Schaamglied glatt und straff war. Es ist

91 τριοπραγμοσύνη Plato, rep. 4, 444 b.), ἀνθρωπάρεσκος (Lob. 621),
6th ed. ποταμοφόρητος (cf. ὑδατοφόρητος Const. Man. 409), καρδιογνώστης
112 (καρδιόπληκτος Theoph. I. 736, καρδιοκολάπτης Leo Gr. 441), σητόβρωτος, ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, εἰδωλολάτρης,[1] εἰδωλόθυτον (Cedren.
95 I. 286, cf. the abstract εἰδωλοθυσία Theophan. 415), δεσμοφύλαξ
7th ed. (νωτοφύλαξ Theophan. I. 608), ὁρκωμοσία (cf. ἀπωμοσία, κατωμοσία), πατροπαράδοτος (θεοπαράδοτος Theophan. I. 627), ἰσάγγελος (Theoph. I. 16), εὐπερίστατος, πολυποίκιλος, the Adverb παμπληθεί (the Adj. παμπληθής is found in good authors), εἰλικρινής, εἰλικρίνεια (Fuhr, Dicaearch. p. 198).

To the compound δευτερόπρωτος in Luke vi. 1 (?) comes nearest δευτεροδεκάτη found in Jerome on Ezek. c. 45. As the latter means *second-tenth*, so the former *second-first*.

Δωδεκάφυλος, the Neut. of which is used as a noun in Acts xxvi. 7, is sustained by τετράφυλος Her. 5, 66.

More rarely is the first part of the compound a *verb*, as in ἐθελοθρησκεία *self-chosen worship*; cf. ἐθελοδουλία.

Compound adjectives whose first part is *α* privative exhibit nothing anomalous, though perhaps many of them were not current in written Greek (ἀμετανόητος, ἀνεξερεύνητος, ἀνεξιχνίαστος); only ἀνέλεος Jas. ii. 13, which Lchm. on the authority of good Codd. [Sin. also] has received into the text instead of ἀνίλεως, is singular, as the Greeks used ἀνηλεής, or at least ἀνελεής (Lob. 710). Ἀνέλεος would be formed like ἄνελπις, ἄπαις, and may have been intended as a verbal antithesis to ἔλεος. Even Bttm. II. 467 considered the *α* of the verb ἀτενίζω, derived from the Adj. ἀτενής, to be the so-called *α* intensive; but it is better to take it, with Lob. pathol. I. 35, for *α* formative. See besides Döderlein, de ἄλφα intensivo sermonis graeci, Erl. 1830, 4to.

b. When the last part of the compound is a verb — in compound verbs therefore — the verbal stem is regularly found unaltered only in combination with the so-called old prepositions (Scaliger in Lob. Phryn. 266; Bttm. II. 469 f.); in other cases with a change so far forth as the verb strictly speaking first adopts its ending from a noun formed out of the stem, as ἀδυνατεῖν, ὁμολογεῖσθαι, νουθετεῖν, εὐεργετεῖν, τροποφορεῖν, ὀρθοτομεῖν (cf. ὀρθοτομία

so in der Art euphemistischer Ausdrücke, dass sie allgemein gehalten werden; die, unter welchen sie gangbar werden, verständigen sich bald über ihren Sinn.

[1] Cf. ἀνθρωπολάτρης Ephraem. p. 743, πυρσολάτρης Pachym. 134; Geo. Pisid. Heracl. 1, 14, 182, ψευδολάτρης Theodos. acroas. 2, 73, likewise χριστολάτρης frequent in Byzantine authors.

Theophan. cont. p. 812), *ἀγαθοεργεῖν* and *ἀγαθουργεῖν*,[1] *μετριοπαθεῖν*, etc.

This rule, however, has some undoubted exceptions; Scaliger 113
long ago pointed out *δυσθνήσκω* in Eurip. (cf. Bttm. II. 472). *Εὐδοκεῖν*, therefore, is directly formed from *δοκεῖν*, and not, as Passow maintained, from an intermediate noun *δόκος* (Fr. Rom. II. 370); it arose simply from a combination of the words in speaking; cf. Bttm. II. 470. The same remark applies to *καραδοκεῖν* (not to be referred to *δοκεύω*, Fritzschior. opusc. p. 151); no noun 92
καραδόκος exists. Even *ὁμείρεσθαι*, which in 1 Thess. ii. 8 the 6th ed.
better Codd. [Sin. also] have instead of *ἱμείρεσθαι*, might be admissible, were it to be derived from *ὁμοῦ*, *ὁμός* and *εἴρειν* (Fr. Mr. p. 792). To be sure, no verb of the kind with *ὁμ.* is to be found 96
elsewhere; for *ὁμαδέω* comes from *ὅμαδος*; and *ὁμοδρομεῖν*, *ὁμοδο-* 7th ed.
ξεῖν, *ὁμευνετεῖν*, *ὁμηρεύειν*, *ὁμοζυγεῖν*, *ὁμιλεῖν*, even *ὁμονοεῖν* (Bttm. II. 473), are likewise derived from nouns. Besides, the Genitive, governed as above by the verb, would be strange (cf. Mtth. II. 907). Perhaps, however, the first objection should not be pressed in the case of a word formed in the language of the people. If *μείρεσθαι*, which occurs in Nicand. Ther. 400 for *ἱμείρεσθαι*, were the original form, *μείρεσθαι* and *ὁμείρεσθαι* might exist side by side as well as *δύρεσθαι* and *ὀδύρεσθαι*; indeed *ὁμείρεσθαι* is perhaps the true reading (Lob. Pathol. 72).

A formation peculiar to the Hellenistic idiom is *προσωπολημπτεῖν* (*προσωπολήμπτης*, *προσωπολημψία* Theodos. acroas. 1, 32, *ἀπροσωπολήμπτως*, Acta apocr. p. 86). A corresponding verb is *ἀκαταλημπτεῖν* in Sext. Emp. I. 201; for the concrete derivative, however, compare *δωρολήμπτης* and *ἐργολήμπτης* in the Sept.; and for the abstract *προσωπολημψία*, cf. *ἐρωτολημψία* Ephraem. pp. 3104, 7890; Nicet. Eugen. 4, 251.

Many other compound *nouns* of this sort, in which, as in *προσωπολήμπτης*, *θανατηφόρος*,[2] the second part is derived from a verb while the first denotes the object, etc. (Bttm. II. 478), occur in the N. T. but are unknown to the Greeks: e.g. *δεξιολάβος he who takes position at one's right*, hence an attendant.

From such compounds arise in turn, not only abstract nouns (*σκηνοπηγία* even, belongs to this class, as though from *σκηνοπηγός*,

[1] On these forms see *Bttm.* II. 457. Against *οἰκουργεῖν* and *οἰκουργός* (Tit. ii. 5 var.) cf. *Fr.* de crit. conform. p. 29.

[2] Also *αὐθάδης* is a compound of this description, from *αὐτός* and *ἥδειν*, *ἥδεσθαι* *Bttm.* II. 458.

according to numerous analogies, as κλινοπηγία), but also verbs: λιθοβολεῖν from λιθοβόλος (cf. ἀνθοβολεῖν, θηροβολεῖν, ἡλιοβο-
114 λεῖσθαι, etc.), ὀρθοποδεῖν from ὀρθόπους, δεξιολαβεῖν Leo Gram. p. 175 (Bttm. II. 479).

In decomposite verbs, the preposition which constitutes the double composition is naturally put first, as ἀπεκδέχεσθαι, συναντιλαμβάνεσθαι. Διαπαρατριβή in 1 Tim. vi. 5 would violate this rule, if it must mean *misplaced diligence* or *unprofitable disputing*. For *this* word can only signify *continued* (endless) *hostilities*, *collisions*; παραδιατριβή would be required to express the former meaning. The majority of the Codd., however, [Sin. also] have διαπαρατριβή and this Lchm. has printed. A transposition of the prepositions is accordingly assumed (even by Fr. Mr. p. 796). Yet διαπαρατριβή *continued dissension*, is not unsuited to the passage. The other compounds beginning with διαπαρα which occur, viz. 1 Kings vi. 4 διαπαρακύπτεσθαι, and 2 Sam. iii. 30 διαπαρατηρεῖν, would be regular according to their respective import, if no doubt existed regarding the former;
93 see Schleusner, thes. philol. sub voc. The double compound παρακαταθήκη
8th ed. and the compound παραθήκη are equivalent in meaning (Lennep ad Phalar. ep. p. 198, Lips.; Lob. 312). The latter, however, is better established
97 in the N. T. The Codd. exhibit variations of both forms even in Thuc.
7th ed. 2, 72 (see the commentators), and in Plutarch. ser. vind. see Wyttenb. II. 530. Cf. besides Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 529.

Many verbs, compound as well as decompound, are found in Biblical Greek which do not occur in the classic language. In particular, verbs which the older writers used as simple, appear strengthened with prepositions which exhibit as it were to the senses the mode of the action (for the later language loves, in general, what is graphic and expressive); e.g. καταλιθάζειν to stone *down* to death, ἐξορκίζειν to get a declaration on oath *out of* one, ἐξαστράπτειν to flash *forth*, ἐκγαμίζειν to give away (*out of* the family) in marriage (*elocare*), διεγείρειν, ἐξανατέλλειν, ἐξομολογεῖν, and many others; see my five Progr. de verborum cum praepositt. compositor. in N. T. usu. Lips. 1834–43, 4to.

In the same way, and for the same reason, compound and double compound adverbs (prepositions) were used in later Greek; as, ἐπάνω, κατενώπιον, κατέναντι. In Byzantine authors such formations are carried to a greater extent than in Biblical Greek; cf. e.g. κατεπάνω in Constantin. Porphyrogen.

Note 1. Proper names, particularly such as are compounds, frequently appear in the N. T. in those contracted forms which are peculiar to the language of the people, and which are in part very bold (Lob. 434, cf. Schmid on Horat. epp. 1, 7, 55); as, Ἀπολλώς for Ἀπολλώνιος, Ἀρτεμᾶς for Ἀρτεμίδωρος Tit. iii. 12, Νυμφᾶς for Νυμφόδωρος Col. iv. 15,[1] Ζηνᾶς for

[1] *Keil* in the Philologus II. 468 expressed his conviction that he had found this name in an inscription in *Böckh*.

Ζηνόδωρος Tit. iii. 13, Παρμενᾶς for Παρμενίδης Acts vi. 5, Δημᾶς probably 115
for Δημέας, Δημήτριος or Δήμαρχος Col. iv. 14; 2 Tim. iv. 10, probably
also Ὀλυμπᾶς for Ὀλυμπιόδωρος Rom. xvi. 15, Ἐπαφρᾶς for Ἐπαφρόδιτος
Col. i. 7; iv. 12, and Ἑρμᾶς for Ἑρμόδωρος Rom. xvi. 14, Θευδᾶς for Θεύδωρος
i.e. Θεόδωρος, and Λουκᾶς for *Lucanus* (in Greek authors cf. Αλεξᾶς for
Ἀλέξανδρος Jos. bell. 6, 1, 8, Μηνᾶς for Μηνόδωρος, Πυθᾶς for Πυθόδωρος,
Μετρᾶς Euseb. H. E. 6, 41). Many also in ας not circumflexed appear
to be abbreviated; as, Ἀμπλίας for *Ampliatus* Rom. xvi. 8, Ἀντίπας for
Ἀντίπατρος Rev. ii. 13, Κλεόπας for Κλεόπατρος Luke xxiv. 18, perhaps
Σίλας for Σιλουανός; see Heumann, Poecile III. 314. Σώπατρος for Σωσί-
πατρος Acts xx. 4 (which even some Codd. give) would be likewise a very
violent contraction, though nearer the beginning. Σώπατρος, however,
may be an original form. On the other hand, proper names in λαος, which
probably not (Mtth. I. 149) the Dorians alone contracted into λας, occur
in the N. T. uncontracted: Νικόλαος, Ἀρχέλαος. Moreover, how even the
earlier Greeks contracted names of persons for the sake of euphony,
K. Keil has shown by examples in his spec. onomatolog. gr. (L. 1840, 8vo.)
p. 52 sqq. The German affords examples of similar abbreviations and
contractions in great numbers, some very forced, as Klaus from Nikolaus,
Käthe (Kathi) from Katharina; many of them have become independent
names which even occur in literature, as Fritz (Friedrich), Heinz (Hein-
rich), Hans, Max. Cf. Lob. prolegg. pathol. p. 504 sqq. In general, 94
however, on Greek names of persons see Sturz, Progr. de nominib. Graecor., 6th ed.
also in his Opusc. (Lips. 1825, 8vo.), W. Pape, Wörterb. der griech. Eigen- 98
namen. Brschw. 1842, 8vo. (Hall. L. Z. 1843. No. 106–108), and the 7th ed.
Beiträge zur Onomatologie by Keil in Schneidewin, Philologus, vols. 2
and 3.

Note 2. Latin words adopted into the Greek of the N. T., — mostly sub-
stantives denoting Roman judicial institutions, coins, or articles of dress,—
exhibit nothing peculiar with regard to form. Latin verbs made to assume
Greek forms make their first appearance later, in the Greek style of the
Pseudepigrapha, the Byzantines, etc. See Thilo, Acta App. Petri et Pauli,
Hal. 1837, 4to. I. p. 10 sq.

99
7th ed.
95
6th ed.
116

PART III.

SYNTAX.

A. IMPORT AND USE OF THE SEVERAL PARTS OF SPEECH.

CHAPTER I.

OF THE ARTICLE.[1]

§ 17. THE ARTICLE AS A PRONOUN.

1. The article ὁ, ἡ, τό was originally a demonstrative pronoun, and is regularly employed as such in epic poetry, — to which belongs the quotation from Aratus in Acts xvii. 28: τοῦ γὰρ γένος ἐσμέν; cf. Soph. Oed. R. 1082 τῆς γὰρ πέφυκα μητρός (Mtth. 737. For prose cf. Athen. 2, p. 37).

In prose on the other hand the article is ordinarily equivalent to a demonstrative pronoun only —

a. In the current formulas ὁ μὲν ... ὁ δέ, οἱ μὲν ... οἱ δέ,[2] sometimes in reference to a subject previously mentioned: *this ... that, the one ... the other* Acts xiv. 4; xvii. 32; xxviii. 24; Heb. vii. 20 f.; Gal. iv. 23 (Schaef. Dion. 421), sometimes partitively without such reference, Eph. iv. 11 ἔδωκεν τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους, τοὺς δὲ προφήτας, τούς δὲ, etc. (*some ... others*).

b. In the course of narration, in the simple phrase ὁ δέ, οἱ δέ,
100 *but he*, etc. (as opposed to some other subject); as, Matt. xiii. 29
7th ed. ὁ δὲ ἔφη, ii. 9 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐπορεύθησαν, ii. 14; ix. 31; Luke

[1] *A. Kluit*, vindiciae artic. in N. T. Traj. et Alcmar. 1768–1771. P. I. Tom. I.–III., P. II. Tom. I. II. 8vo. (the book itself is written in Dutch), *T. F. Middleton*, the doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the criticism and illustration of the New Test. Lond. 1808, 8vo.; cf. *Schulthess* in the theol. Annal. 1808, S. 56 ff. *E. Valpy*, a short treatise on the doctrine of the Greek Article, according to Middleton, etc., briefly and compendiously explained as applicable to the criticism of the N. T., prefixed to his Greek Testament with English notes. Lond. 3rd ed. 1834, 3 Vols. 8vo. *Emmerling's* remarks on the Article in the N. T. in Keil and Tzschirner's Analekt. I. II. 147 ff. are unimportant. On the other hand, *Bengel* Matt. xviii. 17 discusses the subject briefly but to the purpose.

[2] On the accentuation see *Hm.* Vig. p. 700. On the other side, *Krüg.* p. 83.

iii. 13; viii. 21; xx. 12; Jno. i. 39; ix. 38; Acts i. 6; ix. 40, etc. 117
(Xen. A. 2, 3, 2; Aesch. dial. 3, 15, 17; Philostr. Ap. 1, 21, 5; Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 26, 29 etc.)

For οἱ μὲν ... οἱ δέ are found also οἱ μὲν ... ἄλλοι δέ Jno. vii. 12, οἱ μὲν 96
... ἄλλοι δὲ ... ἕτεροι δέ Matt. xvi. 14 (Plato, legg. 2, 658 b.; Ael. 2, 34; 6th ed
Palaeph. 6, 5), τινὲς ... οἱ δέ Acts xvii. 18, cf. Plato, legg. 1, 627 a. and Ast on the passage. Similar expressions are still more diversified in Greek authors (Mtth. 742).

Instead of the Article, the Relative also is employed in such antithetical statements; as, 1 Cor. xi. 21 ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς δὲ μεθύει, Matt. xxi. 35 ὃν μὲν ἔδειραν, ὃν δὲ ἀπέκτειναν, etc., Acts xxvii. 44; Rom. ix. 21; Mark xii. 5; cf. Polyb. 1, 7, 3; 3, 76 4; Thuc. 3, 66; see Georgi, Hierocr. I. 109 sqq.; Hm. Vig. 706. Once ὃς μὲν ... ἄλλος δέ 1 Cor. xii. 8 (Xen. A. 3, 1, 35); ὃ μὲν (Neut.) ... καὶ ἕτερον Luke viii. 5 ff.; in 1 Cor. xii. 28 an anacoluthon is easily perceived. See in general Bhdy. 306 f. (In Rom. xiv. 2 ὁ δέ is not related to ὃς μέν, but ὁ is the Article belonging to ἀσθενῶν.)

2. In Matt. xxvi. 67; xxviii. 17 οἱ δέ is used of a second party without a first's having been designated by οἱ μέν. The former passage ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ ἐῤῥάπισαν would more regularly run thus: καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκολάφ.; but as he writes ἐκολάφ. the author has no second distributive clause definitely in mind as yet; but when he subjoins οἱ δὲ ἐῤῥ. it becomes self-evident that ἐκολάφ. applies to a part only of the actors; cf. Xen. H. 1, 2, 14 οἱ αἰχμάλωτοι ... ᾤχοντο ἐς Δεκέλειαν, οἱ δ' ἐς Μέγαρα, Cyr. 3, 2, 12; see Poppo ad. Cyr. p. 292; Bremi, Demosth. p. 273. So, in Matt. xxviii., it is first stated in general terms οἱ ἕνδεκα μαθηταὶ ... ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν; that this, however, is to be understood only of the greater number is clear from what follows — οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν. In Luke ix. 19 οἱ δέ refers regularly to the previously mentioned μαθηταί vs. 18, and should seem to denote that all gave the answer which follows; but the expressions ἄλλοι δὲ ... ἄλλοι δέ show that the answer was given by only a part of the disciples. Matt. xvi. 14 is more regular: οἱ δὲ εἶπον· οἱ μὲν Ἰωάννην ... ἄλλοι δὲ ... ἕτεροι δέ.

§ 18. ARTICULUS PRAEPOSITIVUS, a. BEFORE NOUNS. 118

1. When ὁ, ἡ, τό is employed as strictly an Article before a noun, it marks the object as one definitely conceived,[1] whether in

[1] Cf. Epiphan. haer. 1, 9, 4. — *Herm.* praef. ad Eurip. Iphig. Aul. p. 15: articulus quoniam origine pronomen demonstrativum est, definit infinita idque duobus modis, aut designando certo de multis aut quae multa sunt, cunctis in unum colligendis.

101 consequence of its nature, or the context, or some circle of ideas
7th ed. assumed as known; as, Mark i. 32 ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, Jno. i. 52 ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα, 1 Cor. xv. 8 ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὤφθη κἀμοί (the only abortion among the apostles), Acts xxvii. 38 ἐκβαλλόμενοι τὸν σῖτον εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν *the* grain (which was the vessel's cargo), Luke iv. 20 πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον (which had been handed to him
97 vs. 17) ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ (the beadle of the synagogue), Jno. xiii.
6th ed. 5 βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς τὸν νιπτῆρα *the basin* (that stood there, as usual), cf. Matt. xxvi. 26 f.; Jno. vi. 3 ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος *into the mountain* (situated just there on the farther shore vs. 1), 1 Cor. v. 9 ἔγραψα ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ (which Paul had previously written to the Cor.), Acts ix. 2 ᾐτήσατο ἐπιστολὰς εἰς Δαμασκὸν πρὸς τὰς συναγωγάς to *the* synagogues (there in Damascus), Rev. xx. 4 ἐβασίλευσαν μετὰ Χριστοῦ τὰ χίλια ἔτη *the* thousand years (the known duration of the Messiah's kingdom), Jas. ii. 25 Ῥαὰβ ἡ πόρνη ὑποδεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους *the* spies (mentioned in the history of Rahab), Heb. ix. 19 λαβὼν τὸ αἷμα τῶν μόσχων καὶ τῶν τράγων with allusion to Exod. xxiv. 8. So 1 Cor. vii. 3 τῇ γυναικί ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἀποδιδότω *the* (i.e. matrimonial) *attention due*, vii. 29 ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος ἐστίν; cf. vs. 26 διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην. The Article thus refers to known facts, arrangements, or opinions, Acts v. 37; xxi. 38; Heb. xi. 28; 1 Cor. x. 1, 10; 2 Thess. ii. 3; Jno. i. 21; ii. 14; xviii. 3; Matt. viii. 4, 12, or to something previously mentioned, Matt. ii. 7 (1); Luke ix. 16 (13); Acts ix. 17, (11); Jno. iv. 43 (40); Acts xi. 13 (x. 3, 22); Jas. ii. 3 (2); Jno. xii. 12 (1); xx. 1 (xix. 41); Heb. v. 4 (1); Rev. xv. 6 (1). Accordingly ὁ ἐρχόμενος is *the Messiah*, ἡ κρίσις *the* (*last*) *judgment*, ἡ γραφή *the holy Scripture*, ἡ σωτηρία *Christian salvation*, ὁ πειράζων *the Tempter* — Satan, etc. So also of geographical designations, ἡ ἔρημος *the* desert, so called by way of eminence, הַמִּדְבָּר, i.e. according to the context, either the Arabian desert (of Mount Sinai) Jno. iii. 14; vi. 31; Acts vii. 30, or the desert of Judea Matt. iv. 1; xi. 7.

119 To be particularly noticed, further, is the use of a Singular with the Article to express in the person of a definite individual a whole class; as when we say, *the soldier* must be trained to arms: 2 Cor. xii. 12 τὰ σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, Matt. xii. 35 ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος . . . ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθά, xv. 11; xviii. 17; Luke x. 7; Gal. iv. 1; Jas. v. 6. Allied to this is the Singular in parables and allegories: Jno. x. 11 ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν, where the Good Shepherd is brought forward as an *ideal*; Matt. xiii. 3 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείρειν (where Luther incorrectly has, *a sower*). See Krü. 86 f.

Note. According to Kühnöl the Article (cf. the emphatic *das* in German) sometimes includes the force of the pronoun *this* (cf. Siebelis, Pausan. I. 50; Boisson. Babr. p. 207), Matt. i. 25 τὸν υἱόν for τοῦτον τὸν 102
υἱόν, Jno. vii. 17 γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς, vs. 40 ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου, Acts xxvi. 10 7th ed.
τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἐξουσίαν λαβών, Mark xiii. 20; Acts ix. 2; but the definite Article is quite sufficient in all such cases. Heumann has gone still further in conceding this import of the Article, and is followed by Schulthess (n. krit. Journ. I. 285), who, with Kühnöl, quite erroneously refers to Mtth. § 286, where *this* use of the Article, which can hardly occur in prose (except Ionic), is not discussed. Col. iv. 16 ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῇ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή we also say, *when the letter is read* (not *the* (this) letter — no such underscoring is needed, since the letter in hand could be the only one thought of); some authorities add αὕτη, but the ancient versions ought 98
not to be reckoned in. In 1 Tim. i. 15 even in German the Demonst. 6th ed.
Pronoun is not required, nor in vi. 13. In 2 Cor. v. 4 the Art. in ἐν τῷ σκήνει is not put δεικτικῶς for τούτῳ, but simply refers back to σκῆνος mentioned in vs. 1. In Col. iii. 8 ἀπόθεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ πάντα is not, *all this* (or *that*) (intensive), but *the whole*, viz. what is immediately (a second time) adduced. Also in Rom. v. 5 ἡ (ἐλπίς) is simply the Article; see Fr. Least of all must ὁ κόσμος be taken for οὗτος ὁ κόσμος; it means *the world* as distinguished from *heaven, the kingdom of heaven*; not *this* world as opposed to another κόσμος. The same judgment must be passed also upon those passages which might be adduced as proofs of this usage in classic authors, Diog. Laert. 1, 72 and 86. One cannot possibly comprehend how the apostles could have been induced, in certain passages where they *thought* the demonstrative pronoun, to employ — not that, but — the article, which is much weaker in every instance. One's sense of linguistic propriety revolts against such a use of language. Besides, explicitness is the very characteristic of the later language in general (and of that of the N. T. also).

By Greek authors, particularly Ionic and Doric (Mtth. 747; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 204), and afterwards by the Byzant. (Malal. p. 95, 102), the Art. was sometimes used for the Relative. Some have asserted that the same use is found in the N. T. in Acts xiii. 9 Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (see 120
Schleusner s. h. v.); but incorrectly, for ὁ καὶ Π. is here equivalent to ὁ καὶ καλούμενος Παῦλος (Schaef. L. Bos. p. 213), and the Article retains its ordinary import, just as in Σ. ὁ Ταρσεύς. Compare the similar Πῖκος ὁ καὶ Ζεύς Malal. ed. Bonn. p. 19 sq.; Act. Thom. p. 34. On the other hand, compare in Hellenistic writers, Psalt. Sal. xvii. 12 ἐν τοῖς κρίμασι, τὰ ποιεῖ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, if the reading is correct. In Wisd. xi. 15, where ὅν the reading of the Cod. Alex. is probably a correction, τὸν is to be regarded as the Article.

2. The use of the Article which has just been discussed is common to the Greek with all languages that possess an Article.

The following cases on the other hand (cases where in German the definite Art. is not used) are to be noticed as peculiar:

103 a. Rev. iv. 7 *τὸ ζῶον ἔχον τὸ πρόσωπον ὡς ἀνθρώπου* (Xen. C.
7th ed. 5, 1, 2 *ὁμοίαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἐσθῆτα*, Theophr. ch. 12 [19] *τοὺς ὄνυχας μεγάλους ἔχων*, Polyaen. 8, 10, 1 a.), Acts xxvi. 24 *μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ ἔφη*, xiv. 10; 1 Cor. xi. 5 (Aristot. anim. 2, 8 and 10; Lucian. catapl. 11; D. S. 1, 70, 83; Pol. 15, 29, 11; Philostr. Ap. 4, 44). We say, *he had eyes like*, etc.; *he spoke with a loud voice*, etc. The Greek here by the Article designates what belongs to the individual in a definite form, as is more obvious from Heb. vii. 24 *ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην he hath the priesthood as unchangeable* (predicate), Mark viii. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 12; iv. 8; Eph. i. 18 and from Matt. iii. 4 *εἶχε τὸ ἔνδυμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τριχῶν καμήλου*, Rev. ii. 18 (differing from the preceding examples by the addition of the pronoun). From Greek authors, for the former cf. Thuc. 1, 10 and 23; Plato, Phaedr. 242 b.; Lucian. dial. deor.
99 8, 1; fugit. 10; eun. 11; D. S. 1, 52; 2, 19; 3, 34; Ael. anim.
8th ed. 13, 15; Pol. 3, 4, 1; 8, 10, 1; see Lob. Phryn. 265; Krü. Dion. H. 126. (The Art. is sometimes omitted e.g. in 2 Pet. ii. 14; cf. Aristot. anim. 2, 8 and 10 with 2, 11.)

b. 1 Cor. iv. 5 *τότε ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἑκάστῳ the praise* which is due him, Rom. xi. 36 *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, xvi. 27; Eph. iii. 21; Gal. i. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Rev. v. 13; Rev. iv. 11 *ἄξιος εἶ λαβεῖν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν τιμήν*, Jas. ii. 14 *τί τὸ ὄφελος ἐὰν πίστιν λέγῃ τις ἔχειν the advantage* to be expected, 1 Cor. xv. 32; 1 Cor. ix. 18 *τίς μοί ἐστιν ὁ μισθός* (Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 212). In general the Art. here denotes that which is due, requisite, etc., Krü. 84. Accordingly it is often used where we employ a Possessive Pronoun; as, Rom. iv. 4 *τῷ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται his reward*, ix. 22; Luke xviii. 15. Cf. Fritzsche, Aristot. Amic. pp. 46, 99.

121 On the other hand, no example occurs of the use of the Art. discussed by Mtth. 714 and Rost 438 in appellations (Schaef. Demosth. IV. 365); for in Rev. vi. 8 *ὄνομα αὐτῷ ὁ θάνατος*, viii. 11 *τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρος λέγεται ὁ ἄψινθος*, xix. 13 *κέκληται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ*, a name is mentioned in every case which belongs individually and exclusively to the object.

3. Adjectives and participles used substantively are, like substantives, rendered definite by the Article; as, 1 Cor. i. 27 *οἱ σοφοί*, Eph. vi. 16 *βέλη τοῦ πονηροῦ*, Gal. i. 23 *ὁ διώκων ὑμᾶς*, Tit. iii. 8 *οἱ πεπιστευκότες τῷ θεῷ*, 1 Cor. ix. 13 *οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι*, Matt. x. 20; 2 Cor. ii. 2; x. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; Heb. xii. 27.

But the place of the noun may be occupied also by an indeclinable part of speech, as an Inf. or an Adverb, 2 Cor. i. 17, or by a phrase, Rom. iv. 14 *οἱ ἐκ νόμου*, Heb. xiii. 24 *οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας* (D. S. 1, 83), Acts xiii. 13 *οἱ περὶ Παῦλον*, Phil. i. 27 *τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν* etc. 1 Cor. xiii. 10 (Krü. 92); and indeed (after *τό*) by a whole proposition, Acts xxii. 30 *γνῶναι τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται* (iv. 21; 1 Thess. iv. 1; Luke xxii. 2, 23, 37), Mark ix. 23 *εἶπεν αὐτῷ τό· εἰ δύνῃ;* Gal. v. 14 *ὁ πᾶς νόμος ἐν ἑνὶ λόγῳ πεπλήρωται, ἐν τῷ· ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου*, Rom. viii. 26; xiii. 9; Luke i. 62; [Matt. xix. 18]. (Sentences thus made prominent are usually 104
quotations or interrogations.) Cf. Plato, Gorg. 461 e. and Phaed. 7th ed.
62 b.; rep. 1, 352 d.; Demosth. Con. 728 c.; Lucian. Alex. 20; Mtth. 730 f.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyph. p. 55, and Men. 25. Even an Adverb or a Genitive connected with the Art. (particularly the Neut.) becomes a virtual Substantive (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. 1. 84; Weber, Demosth. p. 237); as, Luke xvi. 26 *οἱ ἐκεῖθεν*, Jno. viii. 23 *τὰ κάτω, τὰ ἄνω*, Jno. xxi. 2 *οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου*, Luke xx. 25 *τὰ Καίσαρος*, Jas. iv. 14 *τὸ τῆς αὔριον*, 2 Pet. ii. 22 *τὸ τῆς ἀληθοῦς παροιμίας*, 1 Cor. vii. 33 *τὰ τοῦ κόσμου*, 2 Pet. i. 3; 2 Cor. x. 16; Phil. i. 5; Jno. xviii. 6, etc. Krü. 28, 93. So too, in German we can say briefly, *das droben, das des morgenden Tags* (what will happen to-morrow), *die des Zebedäus* (those belonging to him, e.g. sons), see § 30, 3. Often, however, we must use a periphrasis; 100
was dem Kaiser gebührt; etc. As a mere periphrasis, like *τὸ τῆς* 6th ed.
δόξης for *ἡ δόξα* 1 Pet. iv. 14, the neut. Art. is not used in the N.T. (Huther in loc. [1st ed.] to the contrary.)

The Neut. *τό* is sometimes put before nouns to designate them in the abstract, as sounds or combinations of sound: Gal. iv. 25 *τὸ γὰρ Ἄγαρ* etc., *the* (word) *Hagar.*

In many connections a participle used substantively occurs with an article (which is not admissible in German) as a definite predicate to an indefinite subject, Gal. i. 7 *τινές εἰσιν οἱ ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς*, Col. ii. 8 *μή τις ὑμᾶς ἔσται ὁ συλαγαγών*, also Jno. v. 32; Luke xviii. 9; or as a definite subject where, logically, an indefinite was to be expected, Rom. iii. 11 *οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ συνιών* (Jno. v. 45), 2 Cor. xi. 4 *εἰ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει.* But in 122
Greek in all such cases the quality is conceived of as a definite concrete, only the person, who is this concrete in action, remains indefinite. The *ταράσσοντες ὑμᾶς* really exist, only as individuals they are not more closely designated.[1] *If he that cometh* (the preacher who will not fail to appear

[1] Cf. in Latin *sunt qui existimant* as distinguished from *sunt qui existiment*: see *Zumpt*, S. 480.

among you, — person and name are of no consequence), etc.; *he that understandeth is not* (to be found), etc. So Lucian. abdic. 3 ἦσαν τινὲς οἱ μανίας ἀρχὴν τοῦτ' εἶναι νομίζοντες, Lysias bon. Aristoph. 57 εἰσί τινες οἱ προσαναλίσκοντες, Dio Chr. 38, 482 ἤδη τινές εἰσιν οἱ καὶ τοῦτο δεδοικότες, and the frequent εἰσὶν οἱ λέγοντες Mtth. 713, also Xen. A. 2, 4, 5 ὁ ἡγησάμενος οὐδεὶς ἔσται, Thuc. 3. 83 οὐκ ἦν ὁ διαλύσων, Porphyr. abst. 4, 18 οὐδείς ἐστιν ὁ κολάσων, (Sept. Gen. xl. 8; xli. 8; Deut. xxii. 27; 1 Sam. xiv. 39). See Bhdy. 318 f.; Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 107; Doederl. Soph. Oed. Col. p. 296; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 238. Acts ii. 47 ὁ κύριος προσετίθει τοὺς σωζομένους
105 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ means, *he added to the church those that were being saved* (in
7th ed. consequence of their believing), he increased the church by those in whom preaching took effect; cf. Krü. 89.

Between πολλοί and οἱ πολλοί put substantively (the latter is very rare in the N. T.) we find the usual distinction. Οἱ πολλοί means *the* (known) *many* 2 Cor. ii. 17 contrasted with unity, Rom. xii. 5 οἱ πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν (1 Cor. x. 17), or opposed to a definite individual Rom. v. 15, 19, or, without such contrast, *the generality, the* (great) *mass*, the *vulgus* (all but a few) Matt. xxiv. 12; cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 3. 65.

4. Nouns rendered more distinctly definite by οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος as adjectives,[1] always have the Article, inasmuch as they distinguish some individual from the mass (not so in German — nor in English): ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Luke ii. 25, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος xiv. 30, τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον Matt. xiii. 44, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ Matt. vii. 22, ὁ κακὸς δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος Matt. xxiv. 48. Also in Luke vii. 44 the accredited reading is βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα, though ταύτην γυναῖκα, — as the woman was present, — according to Wolf in Dem. Lept. p. 263;
101 Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 243; Krü. 108, would be unexceptionable.
6th ed. Names of persons also with οὗτος usually have the Article; as, Heb. vii. 1; Acts i. 11; ii. 32; xix. 26 (vii. 40).

A noun with πᾶς may either have the Art. or not; πᾶσα πόλις means *every city*, πᾶσα ἡ πόλις *the whole city* Matt. viii. 34 (Rom. iii. 19 ἵνα πᾶν στόμα φραγῇ καὶ ὑπόδικος γένηται πᾶς ὁ κόσμος); πᾶσαι γενεαί *all* generations, whatever their number, πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί Matt. i. 17 *all the* generations, known as a definite plural
123 either from the context or some other source. Cf. Sing. Matt. iii. 10; vi. 29; xiii. 47; Jno. ii. 10; Luke vii. 29; Mark v. 33; Phil. i. 3; Plur. Matt. ii. 4; iv. 24; Luke xiii. 27; Acts xxii. 15; Gal. vi. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 16 (where there is not much authority for the Art.).

[1] It is otherwise when these pronouns are predicates; as, Rom. ix. 8 ταῦτα τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ, Luke i. 36 οὗτος μὴν ἕκτος ἐστίν, Jno. iv. 18 τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας, ii. 11, etc. Cf. *Fr.* Mt. 663; *Schaef.* Plut. IV. 377.

The following are *not* exceptions:[1] Matt. ii. 3 πᾶσα Ἰεροσόλυμα *all* Jerusalem (for Ἰεροσόλυμα is a proper name, see paragraph 5), Acts ii. 36 πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραήλ *the whole house* of Israel (for this too is treated as a proper name 1 Sam. vii. 2 f.; Neh. iv. 16; Judith viii. 6). In Eph. iii. 15 πᾶσα πατριά obviously means *every* race, Col. iv. 12 ἐν παντὶ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ *in every will of God* (in everything which God wills), 1 Pet. i. 15 ἐν πάσῃ ἀναστροφῇ *in omni vitae modo.*

Still less are the following instances to be considered as exceptional: Jas. i. 2 πᾶσαν χαρὰν ἡγήσασθε, Eph. i. 8 ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ (2 Cor. xii. 12; Acts xxiii. 1) *all* (full) *joy*, *in all* (full) *wisdom* 106
— for they are abstracts denoting a whole, where every wisdom 7th ed.
and all wisdom substantially coincide, Krü. 106. Only in Eph. ii. 21 there is preponderating authority for πᾶσα οἰκοδομή, though, since the church of Christ as a whole is spoken of, *the whole building* is the proper translation; A C [Sin.**] however, actually give the Art., which owing to the Itacism might easily have fallen out.

Πᾶς joined to a participle not equivalent to a noun demands particular notice: πᾶς ὀργιζόμενος means *every one angry* (when, if, while he is angry), cf. 1 Cor. xi. 4, but πᾶς ὁ ὀργιζόμενος Matt. v. 22 *every angry* person i.q. πᾶς ὅστις ὀργίζεται; cf. Luke vi. 47; xi. 10; Jno. iii. 20; xv. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 25; 1 Thess. i. 7, etc.; Krü. 89. This distinction must guide our judgment respecting the double reading Luke xi. 4 παντὶ ὀφείλοντι and παντὶ τῷ ὀφείλοντι, see Mey.

Τοιοῦτος is joined to a noun without an Art. when *such*, *any such*, *of this sort*, is meant; as, Matt. ix. 8 ἐξουσία τοιαύτη, Mark iv. 33 τοιαῦται παραβολαί, Acts xvi. 24 παραγγελία τοιαύτη, 2 Cor. iii. 12. When, on the other hand, a particular object is pointed out as *such a* or *of such a sort*, the noun naturally takes the Art.; as, Mark ix. 37 ἓν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων (with reference to παιδίον in vs. 36 that represents childhood), Jno. iv. 23; 2 Cor. xii. 3, cf. 102
vs. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 13; Schaef. Demos. III. 136; Schneider, Plat. civ. II. p. 1. 6th ed.

Ἕκαστος, which is seldom employed adjectively in the N. T., is always 124
joined to a substantive without an Art., Orelli, Isocr. Antid. p. 255, (9), Luke vi. 44 ἕκαστον δένδρον, Jno. xix. 23 ἑκάστῳ στρατιώτῃ, Heb. iii. 13 καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, Bornem. Xen. An. p. 69. In Greek authors the Art. often accompanies nouns with ἕκαστος; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 93 and Hipp. Maj. 164.

[1] Only nouns of the class mentioned in § 19, 1. can, even when joined to πᾶς (*the whole*), dispense with the Article, e.g. πᾶσα γῆ; cf. Thuc. ed. *Poppo*, III. II. p. 224. In the N. T. *this* word always has the Article; as, Matt. xxvii. 45 ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, Rom. x. 18, etc. Finally, the passages *Thiersch*, de Pentat. Alex. p. 121, has quoted to prove the omission of the Art. with πᾶς (*the whole*) in the Sept., are for the most part quite irrelevant.

Τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα means *the same Spirit;* but αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα *the Spirit Himself*, Krü. 107. Compare for the former Rom. ix. 21; Phil. i. 30; Luke vi. 38; xxiii. 40; 2 Cor. iv. 13; for the latter Rom. viii. 26; 1 Cor. xv. 28; 2 Cor. xi. 14; Jno. xvi. 27. In both cases the Art. is never omitted in the N. T. with appellatives,— (Luke xx. 42; xxiv. 15 therefore are no exceptions; Bornem. Schol. p. 158.)[1] — as it is sometimes in Greek authors, that is to say in the former case, especially in epic poetry, Hm. Opusc. I. 332 sqq., and in later prose (index to Agath. ed. Bonn. p. 411); in the latter case, even in the better prose authors, Krü. Dion. H. 454 sq.; Bornem. Xen. An. p. 61; Poppo, index ad Cyr. sub verb.

5. Proper names, as they already denote a definite individual, do not *require* the Art., nevertheless, as the established sign of definiteness, it is often joined to them. First, in regard to geographical names:

a. The names of countries (and rivers) more frequently take the Art. than those of cities (cf. die Schweiz, die Lausitz, die Lombardei, das Elsass, das Tyrol, etc.).

107 The following never or very seldom occur without the Art.:
7th ed. Ἰουδαία, Ἀχαΐα, Ἰορδάνης, Ἰταλία, Γαλιλαία, Μυσία, Ἀσία (Acts ii. 9, yet see vi. 9; 1 Pet. i. 1), Σαμάρεια (Luke xvii. 11), Συρία (Acts xxi. 3), Κρήτη (yet Tit. i. 5). Only Αἴγυπτος always is used without the Art., and with Μακεδονία usage varies.

b. Names of cities most rarely have the Art. when connected with a preposition (Locella, Xen. Ephes. pp. 223, 242), particularly with ἐν, εἰς, or ἐκ; cf. the words Δαμασκός, Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ἱεροσόλυμα, Τάρσος, Ἔφεσος, Ἀντιόχεια, Καπερναούμ in the concordance. Only Καισάρεια, Ῥώμη and Τρωάς vary strangely.

c. Sometimes it is to be observed that a geographical name, when it occurs for the first time in the narration, has not the Article, but takes it on being repeated; as, Acts xvii. 15 ἕως Ἀθηνῶν first time, then vs. 16, xviii. 1, with the Art.; Acts xvii. 10 εἰς Βέροιαν, then vs. 13 ἐν τῇ B.; Acts xvi. 9 διαβὰς εἰς Μακεδονίαν, then
125 six times with the Art. (only in xx. 3 without it); Acts xx. 15 ἤλθομεν εἰς Μίλητον, vs. 17 ἀπὸ τῆς Μιλήτου.

Ἱερουσαλήμ has the Art. only when accompanied with an adjective; Rev. iii. 12; Gal. iv. 25 f.; besides in Acts v. 28 in the Acc. (on the contrary, Luke xxiv. 18; Acts i. 19, etc.). Ἱεροσόλυμα occurs in the oblique cases with the Art. only in Jno. (v. 2; x. 22; xi. 18).

103 6. The use of the Art. with names of persons (Bhdy. 317; Mdv.
6th ed. 17) can hardly be reduced to rule. A comparison of separate

[1] In Matt. xii. 50 it is quite unnecessary with *Fr.* to take αὐτός for ὁ αὐτός.

passages will easily convince one of the capricious irregularity of writers,[1] and that he cannot go far with the distinction (Hm. praef. ad Iphig. Aul. p. 16; Fr. Mt. p. 797; Weber, Demosth. p. 414) that a proper name is first introduced without the Art. but takes it when repeated (cf. Matt. xxvii. 24, 58 with 62; Mark xv. 1, 14, 15 with 43; Luke xxiii. 1 ff. with 6 and 13; Jno. xviii. 2 with 5; Acts vi. 5 with 8 f.; viii. 1 with 3 and ix. 8; Acts viii. 5 with 6, 12);[2] nor with that other (Thilo, Apocr. I. 163 sq.), 'proper names when in the Nominative usually did not take the Art., but frequently had it when in the oblique cases.'[3] Hence the authority of the best MSS. must decide mainly whether the Art. shall stand or not.[4] Proper names which are rendered definite by subjoined names of kindred or of office, usually (even in the classics Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 154, yet see Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 417 sq.; Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 37) dispense with the Art. (since they first become definite by means of the predicate): Gal. i. 19 *Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου*, Matt. x. 4 *Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης*, ii. 1, 3; iv. 21; xiv. 1; Mark x. 47; xvi. 1; Jno. xviii. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 2; Rom. xvi. 8 ff.; Acts i. 13; xii. 1; xviii. 8, 17. Thus Pausan. e.g. 2, 1, 1; 3, 9, 1; 7, 18, 6; Aeschin. Tim. 179 c.; Diog. L. 4, 32; 7, 10, 13; 8, 58, 63; Demosth. Theocr. 511 c. and Apat. 581 b.; Phorm. 605 b., etc.; Conon. 728 b.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 8; 2, 1, 5; Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 20. 22. 39. 41. 42. 51. 69. 95 etc. On the other hand, with indeclinable names of persons where the case is not at once apparent from a preposition, appended title, etc. (as in Mark xi. 10; Luke i. 32; Jno. iv. 5; Acts ii. 29; vii. 14; xiii. 22; Rom. iv. 1; Heb. iv. 7) perspicuity seems to require the Art.: Matt. i. 18; xxii. 42; Mark xv. 45; Luke ii. 16; Acts vii. 8; Rom. ix. 13; xi. 25; Gal.

7th ed.

108

126

[1] In German, as is well known, the use of the Article before names of persons is provincial. *Der Lehmann*, common in Southern Germany, would sound strange in Northern Germany.

[2] Even a person who is mentioned for the first time may take the Article when one well known to the reader, or otherwise sufficiently particularized.

[3] Compare in particular the want of uniformity in the use of the Article with Παῦλος and Πέτρος in the Acts. Πιλάτος in Jno. has always the Article; but in the Acts, never; in Matt. and Mark we find with few exceptions ὁ Πιλάτος. Τίτος has never the Article.

[4] That in the addresses of letters the names of persons are *without* the Article may be seen from the collections of Greek letters, from Diog. L. (e.g. 3, 22; 8, 49, 80; 9, 13) from Plutarch. Apophth. lac p. 191, from Lucian. parasit. 2, etc. Cf. 2 Jno. 1. The address in 1 Pet. i. 1 Πέτρος ... ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις, and also Rev. i. 4, are probably to be referred to this rule. Even characterizing predicates dispense with the Article in addresses, Diog. L. 7, 7 and 8.

iii. 8; Heb. xi. 17, etc. (Hence Paul in Rom. x. 19[1] would undoubtedly have written *μὴ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ οὐκ ἔγνω;* had he regarded
104 Ἰσραήλ as the object; cf. 1 Cor. x. 18; Luke xxiv. 21). In the
6th ed. genealogies Matt. i. and Luke iii. this is observed throughout, but also where the names are declinable. With regard to proper names, too, the Codd. often vary.

It may be remarked here that the proper name Ἰούδα, where it is to be taken as the name of a country, never runs in the Sept. ἡ Ἰούδα, τῆς Ἰούδας, etc., but always ἡ γῆ Ἰούδα (1 Kings xii. 32; 2 Kings xxiv. 2), or the inflected ἡ Ἰουδαία is used instead (2 Chr. xvii. 19). Hence in Matt. ii. 6 the conjecture τῆς Ἰούδα is even philologically quite improbable.

7. A Substantive with an Article may be the predicate as well as the subject of a proposition, since even the predicate may be conceived of as a definite individual; (though from the nature of the case the substantive which has the Art. will more frequently be the subject). In the N. T. the predicate has the Art. much more frequently than is usually thought, Krü. 91: Mark vi. 3 *οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων is not this the* (known) *carpenter?* vii. 15 *ἐκεῖνά ἐστι τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον those are the things that defile* etc. xii. 7 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κληρονόμος*, xiii. 11 *οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑμεῖς*
109 *οἱ λαλοῦντες*, Matt. xxvi. 26, 28 *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου, τοῦτό*
7th ed. *ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου*, Jno. iv. 42 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου*, 1 Cor. x. 4 *ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός*, xi. 3 *παντὸς ἀνδρὸς ἡ κεφαλὴ ὁ Χριστός ἐστι*, xv. 56 *ἡ δύναμις τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ νόμος*, 2 Cor. iii. 17 *ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν*, 1 Jno. iii. 4 *ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἀνομία*, Phil. ii. 13 *ὁ θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν*; cf. also Matt. v. 13; vi. 22; xvi. 16; Mark viii. 29; ix. 7; xv. 2; Jno. i. 4, 8, 50; iii. 10; iv. 29;[2] v. 35, 39; vi. 14, 50, 51, 63; ix. 8, 19, 20; x. 7; xi. 25; xiv. 21; Acts iv. 11; vii. 32; viii. 10; ix. 21; xxi. 28, 38; Phil. iii. 3, 19; Eph. i. 23; ii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 3; 2 Cor. iii. 2; 1 Jno. iv. 15; v. 6; Jude 19; Rev. i. 17; iii. 17; iv. 5; xvii. 18; xviii. 23; xix. 10; xx. 14. In the following passages the Codd. vary more or less: Rev. v. 6, 8; Acts iii. 25; 1 Jno. ii. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 28; Jno. i. 21. In one instance, one of two nouns in the predicate has not, and the other has, the Art.: Jno. viii. 44 *ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶ*
127 *καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ* (*ψεύδους*) *he is a liar and the father of it* (falsehood). In Greek authors likewise the Article often occurs before

[1] *Fr.* ad l. has quoted passages not to the purpose, and for Gal. vi. 6 he must have meant vi. 16.

[2] Probably also Jno. iv. 37; see *Meyer*.

the predicate; cf. Xen. M. 3, 10, 1; Plato, Phaedr. 64 c.; Gorg. 483 b.; Lucian. dial. m. 17, 1; see Schaef. Demosth. III. 280; IV. 35; Mtth. 706 f. [A copious collection of examples (yet without any real advance as respects the theory) is contained in Dornseiffen, de articulo ap. Graec. ejusque usu in praedicato. Amstel. 1856. 8vo.]

Hence it follows that the oft-repeated rule: 'the subject of a proposition may be known from its having the Art.' is incorrect, as Glassius and Rambach (Instit. herm. p. 446) long ago perceived. Cf. besides, Jen. Lit. Z. 1834, No. 207.

8. In the language of living intercourse it is utterly impossible that the Article should be omitted where it is decidedly necessary (cf., however, § 19), or employed where it is not demanded.[1] *Ὄρος* 105
can never denote THE *mountain*, nor *τὸ ὄρος* A *mountain* (Kühnöl 6th ed.
on Matt. v. 1; Jno. xix. 32 and iii. 10). The N. T. passages — and they were formerly very numerous — in which *ὁ, ἡ, τό* has been taken for the indefinite Article[2] (as is pretended after the manner of the Hebrew Art. Gesen. Lg. 655) may be easily disposed of by the attentive student. 1 Thess. iv. 6 *πλεονεκτεῖν ἐν τῷ πράγματι* means *to overreach in business* (cf. im Handel u. Wandel), Jno. ii. 25 *ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ* in *the* man with whom he (at the time) had to do, (in every man), Krü. 84; cf. Diog. L. 6, 64 *πρὸς τὸν συνιστάντα τὸν παῖδα καὶ λέγοντα ὡς εὐφυέστατός ἐστι . . .* 110
εἶπε, etc. to the person (to every one) recommending the boy, etc., 7th ed.
Jno. iii. 10 *σὺ εἶ ὁ διδάσκαλος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ* Nicodemus is regarded as *the* teacher of Israel *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, as he in whom all erudition is concentred, so that the contrast *καὶ ταῦτα οὐ γινώσκεις* may be made the more palpable (cf. Plato, Crit. 51 a. *καὶ σὺ φήσεις ταῦτα ποιῶν δίκαια πράττειν ὁ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελόμενος* Stallb. Plat. Euth. p. 12; Valcken. Eur. Phoen. p. 552; Krü. 87). In Heb. v. 11 *ὁ λόγος* is *the* (our) discourse, the exposition to be presented by us; cf. Plato, Phaedr. 270 a.

On the other hand, the Article may sometimes, with equal (objective) correctness,[3] be either employed or omitted (Förtsch ad

[1] *Sturz*, Lexic. Xenoph. III. 232, quotes passages even from Xenoph. where the Article is alleged to be put for *τις*. Here applies what Schäfer ad Plutarch. somewhere says: tanta non fuit vis barbarae linguae, ut graecae ipsa fundamenta convellere posset.

[2] This thoughtless rule is not vindicated by reference to such expositors as have attributed to the Art. in certain passages a *false* emphasis (*Glass.* 138 sqq.) or have pressed it unduly. The adjustment between the old view and the new, which *Böhmer* (Introd. in Epist. ad Coloss. p. 291) thinks he has discovered, is unique.

[3] Thus it is easy to explain why one language even regularly employs the Article in

Lys. p. 49 sq.) ; as, Jas. ii. 26 *τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν the body without spirit* (*χωρὶς τοῦ πνεύματος* would be without *the*
128 spirit — requisite for the individual body). In Luke xii. 54 good Codd. have *ὅταν ἴδητε νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν*, whereas the text. rec. has *τὴν νεφέλην*. Both readings are admissible. With the Article the words mean, *when you see the cloud* (which appears in the sky) *rising from the west*, — if the direction of the moving cloud is from the west. In Col. i. 16 *ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα* signifies *the* (existing) *all*, the sum of things, all things collectively (das All) ; *πάντα* would mean, everything that exists, cf. Col. iii. 8 where the two are united. The meaning is but slightly altered by the Article ; yet there is a difference between the two conceptions. In Matt. xxvi. 26 we have *λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν ἄρτον* (which lay before him) ; but in Mark xiv. 22 ; Luke xxii. 19 ; 1 Cor. xi. 23 (according to the best Codd.) *ἄρτον bread*, or a loaf. Cf. besides, Matt. xii. 1 with Mark ii. 23 and Luke vi. 1 ; Matt xix. 3 with Mark x. 2 ; Luke ix. 28 with Mark ix. 2. We
106 find the same alternate omission and use of the Article in parallel
6th ed. clauses : Luke xviii. 2 *τὸν θεὸν μὴ φοβούμενοι καὶ ἄνθρωπον μὴ ἐντρεπόμενοι* ; vs. 27 *τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατά ἐστι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* ; xvii. 34 *ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς· εἷς*[1] *παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται* (*one . . . the other* ; cf., however, Matt. vi. 24 ; xxiv. 40 f.) ; 1 Jno. iii. 18 *μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ μηδὲ τῇ γλώσσῃ* (according to the best Codd., cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 786 *λόγῳ μὲν ἐσθλά, τοῖσι δ' ἔργοισιν κακά*) ; 2 Tim. i. 10 ; 1 Cor. ii. 14, 15 ; Rom. ii. 29 ; iii. 27, 30 ; Heb. ix. 4 ; xi. 38 ; Jude 16 and 19 ; Jno. xii. 5, 6 ; Jas. ii. 17, 20, 26 ; Rev. xx. 1. See Porson, Eurip. Phoen. p. 42, ed. Lips. ; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 58 and his Lex. Soph. II. 247 ; cf. Plat. rep. I. 332 c. and d. ; Xen. A. 3, 4, 7 ; Galen. temper. 1, 4 ; Diog. L. 6, 6 ; Lucian. Eunuch. 6 ; Porphyr. abstin. 1, 14. (The antithesis *ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* is nowhere fully es-
111 tablished Matt. xxviii. 18 ; 1 Cor. viii. 5 ; in both phrases the Art.
7th ed. is wanting without variant in Eph. iii. 15.)

But the *necessity* of the use and of the omission of the Article is obvious in Luke ix. 13 *οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλεῖον ἢ πέντε ἄρτοι καὶ ἰχθύες δύο*, vs. 16

certain cases (*οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, τοὺς φίλους ποιεῖσθαι*) in which another does not (*this man, to believe in gods*). Cf. *Sintenis*, Plut. Themist. p. 190 : Multa, quae nos indefinite cogitata pronuntiamus, definite proferre soliti sunt Graeci, ejus, de quo sermo esset, notitiam animo informatam praesumentes. Such remarks *Kühn.* misuses, ad Mt. p. 123.

[1] This gives support to my exposition of Gal. iii. 20, to which it has always been objected that I have taken *εἷς* for *ὁ εἷς*.

λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας; Rom. v. 7 μόλις ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται, ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν for *a* righteous (upright, blameless) man ... for *the* good man (he, namely, who has proved himself such to him, his benefactor), etc. Rückert has unquestionably misunderstood the passage. In Col. iii. 5 we find four nouns in apposition without the Article, and then a fifth, πλεονεξία, marked by 129
the Article, as denoting a sin well-known and especially to be avoided,[1] one which the apostle further characterizes straightway, — for in ἥτις etc. I cannot find a reference to all the preceding nouns. In 2 Cor. xi. 18 Paul no doubt designedly wrote καυχῶνται κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, different from κατὰ σάρκα (as an adverbial expression), though all recent critics regard both as equivalent. See besides Jno. xviii. 20; Rev. iii. 17, and in connection with an apposition, Rom. viii. 23 υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος, *waiting for adoption* (that is) *the redemption* of the body.

9. The Indefinite Article, (which, when necessary, was denoted by τὶς), is expressed [disputed by Meyer on Matt. viii. 19] in certain instances by the (weakened) numeral εἷς, — as was especially the case in the later writers;[2] as, Matt. viii. 19 προσελθὼν εἷς γραμματεύς, etc., Rev. viii. 13 ἤκουσα ἑνὸς ἀετοῦ.

But ἕν in Jno. vi. 9 is probably not genuine (cf. Matt. ix. 18), and μίαν συκῆν in Matt. xxi. 19 means perhaps *one* (solitary) fig-tree. Εἷς τῶν παρεστηκότων in Mark xiv. 47 resembles the Latin *unus adstantium;* cf. Matt. xviii. 28; Mark xiii. 1; Luke xv. 26 (Herod. 7, 5, 10; Plutarch. Arat. 5 and Cleom. 7; Aeschin. dial. 107
2, 2;[3] Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 249). In Jas. iv. 13 ἐνιαυτὸν ἕνα the 6th ed.
numeral retains its signification; and still more in 2 Cor. xi. 2; Matt. xviii. 14; Jno. vii. 21. See, in general, Boisson. Eunap. 345; Ast, Plat. legg. 219; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 398; Schaef. Long. 399.[4] In Matt. xviii. 24 εἷς ὀφειλέτης μυρίων ταλάντων, there 112
7th ed.

[1] *Weber,* Dem. p. 327. Another case, in which only the last of several connected nouns has, for emphasis' sake, the Article, is discussed by *Jacobitz,* Lucian. pisc. p. 209, ed. min.

[2] So also sometimes the Heb. אֶחָד; see *Gesen.* Lg. S. 655. The use of εἷς in this sense is founded on the above-mentioned peculiarity of the later language, a predilection for expressiveness.

[3] Τὶς τῶν παρ. would have expressed the same meaning, cf. Luke vii. 36; xi. 1 and elsewhere, like *suorum aliquis* etc. in Latin. Both expressions are logically correct, but not precisely alike. *Unus adstantium* implies a numerical unity — *one* of several.

[4] *Bretschneider* tried, very infelicitously, to reduce to this head also 1 Tim. iii. 2, 12; Tit. i. 6 μιᾶς γυναικὸς ἀνήρ giving it the meaning, *he shall be the husband of a wife,* that is, a married man. But besides the fact that the apostle's demand that none but married men should undertake the supervision of a church is not sufficiently substantiated by 1 Tim. iii. 4 f., no careful writer can use εἷς for the indefinite Art. where an ambiguity

130 is probably a designed antithesis. Also in Mark xiv. 51 var. εἷς τις *unus aliquis* (partitive in Mark xiv. 47; Luke xxii. 50; Jno. xi. 49) τὶς does not take away the arithmetical force of εἷς (Heindorf, Plat. Soph. 42; Ast as above, and Plat. Polit. 532; Boisson. Marin. p. 15).

Note 1. In a few particular instances the use or omission of the Article is characteristic of the individual style of the various writers. Thus Gersdorf (Sprachchar. I. 39, 272 ff.) has shown that the four Evangelists almost always write ὁ Χριστός (*the* expected *Messiah*, like ὁ ἐρχόμενος), while Paul and Peter employ Χριστός (as the appellation had become more of a proper name). In the Epistles of Paul and Peter, however, those cases must be excepted where a noun on which Χριστός depends precedes, (as, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἡ ὑπομονὴ τοῦ Χρ., τῷ αἵματι τοῦ Χρ.), since with this noun the Art. is never wanting, Rom. vii. 4; xv. 19; xvi. 16; 1 Cor. i. 6, 17; vi. 15; x. 16; 2 Cor. iv. 4; ix. 13; xii. 9; Gal. i. 7; Eph. ii. 13; 2 Thess. iii. 5, etc. Elsewhere, too, Paul not unfrequently employs the Article before Χριστός, not merely when accompanied by a preposition, but even when in the Nom., as in Rom. xv. 3, 7; 1 Cor. i. 13; x. 4; xi. 3, etc. Similar diversity on this point occurs in the Epistle to the Hebrews, see Bleek on v. 5.

Note 2. MSS. vary extremely in reference to the Article, particularly in those passages where its use or omission is matter of indifference. Here critics must be guided more by the authority of the Codd. than by the supposed style of individual writers. Cf. Matt. xii. 1 στάχυας, Mark vi. 17 ἐν φυλακῇ (better attested than ἐν τῇ φυλ.), vii. 37 (ἀλάλους), x. 2 Φαρισαῖοι, x. 46 υἱός, xi. 4 πῶλον, xii. 33 θυσιῶν, xiv. 33 Ἰάκωβον, xiv. 60 εἰς μέσον,
108 Luke ii. 12 ἐν φάτνῃ, iv. 9 ὁ υἱός, iv. 29 ἕως ὀφρύος τοῦ ὄρους, vi. 35 ὑψίστου,
6th ed. Jno. v. 1; Rom. x. 15; xi. 19; Gal. iv 24; 2 Pet. ii. 8, etc.

Note 3. Strange to say, most expositors — when contrary to their custom they have paid attention to the Article in the N. T. — have given an erroneous opinion respecting it. Bengel, to be sure, is an exception. But Kühnöl is an example. After Krause (a sorry voucher), he supposes that in Acts vii. 38 ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, owing to the use of the Article, signifies *certa populi concio*. This meaning may be rendered probable from the context; but ἡ ἐκκλ. considered grammatically merely may (as Grotius and others maintain) just as well denote the *congregation* קְהַל יִשְׂרָאֵל, and
113 the Article would be as regular in that case as anywhere. Again, the
7th ed.

would be occasioned, for men speak and write in order that others may *understand*. The expression, *there came a man*, supposes also numerical unity, and every one thinks of *homo aliquis* as *homo unus*; but μίαν γυναῖκα ἔχειν cannot be used for γυναῖκα ἔχειν, as it is possible to have several wives (at the same time, or one after another); and consequently numerical unity alone is suggested to everybody. Besides, a person would hardly say, *the bishop must be the husband of a wife*, for, *a husband*, or *married*.

observation of the same scholar on Acts viii. 26 is but half true. Ἡ ἔρημος (ὁδός) must have been used, if Luke wished to distinguish from the rest one particular road known to his readers. But if his meaning was, *this* (*road*) is (now) *deserted, untravelled,* lies waste, the Article would be as little appropriate as in German. Expositors have taken notice of the Art. 131
also in 2 Thess. iii. 14 διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, and have on its account denied the possibility of connecting these words with the following σημειοῦσθε. Perhaps even the omission of the Article in two Codd. may be thus accounted for. Paul, however, might with perfect propriety say διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς σημειοῦσθε if at the time he presumed upon an answer from the Thessalonians: 'Note him to me in *the* epistle (viz. which I hope to receive from you, or which in that event you must send me).' Yet see Lünem.

Note 4. The place of the Article is immediately before the noun to which it belongs; but conjunctions which cannot begin a sentence are regularly inserted between the Article and its noun: Matt. xi. 30 ὁ γὰρ ζυγός μου, iii. 4 ἡ δὲ τροφή, Jno. vi. 14 οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι etc. This is well known, and needs no further illustration. Rost, 436; cf. Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 146.

§ 19. OMISSION OF THE ARTICLE BEFORE NOUNS.

1. Appellatives, which as expressing definite objects should have the Article, are, not merely in the N. T. but in the best Greek authors, employed in certain cases without it. (See Schaefer, Melet. p. 4). This omission, however, only takes place when it produces no ambiguity and leaves no doubt in the mind of the reader whether the object is to be understood as definite or indefinite, i.e.

a. With words which denote objects of which there is but one in existence, and which therefore approximate closely to proper names: thus ἥλιος is almost as common as ὁ ἥλιος, and γῆ (*Earth*) not infrequent for ἡ γῆ, (Poppo, Thuc. III. III. 46); hence the abstract names of virtues and vices, etc.,[1] as ἀρετή, σωφροσύνη, κακία (see Schaef. Demosth. I. 329; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 52; Krü. 87), likewise the names of the members of the animal body (Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 248), very often dispense with the Article.

The Article is omitted also before many other appellatives, as 109
6th ed.

[1] To which must be added the names of sciences and arts (as ἱππική, see *Jacob*, Lucian. Toxar. p. 98), of magisterial dignities and offices (*Schaef.* Demosth. II. 112; *Held*, Plutarch. Aem. P. p. 138), of seasons of the year, of corporations (*Held*, l.c. p. 238), and many others (*Schoem.* ad Isaeum p. 303 and ad Plutarch. Cleom. p. 199). See also *Krü.* 87.

114 πόλις, ἄστυ (Schaef. Plutarch. p. 416; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 111;
7th ed. Weber, Dem. p. 235), ἀγρός (Schaef. Soph. Oed. R. 630), δεῖπνον (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 490; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 57), even
132 πατήρ, μήτηρ, ἀδελφός (Schaef. Mel. l.c. and Demosth. I. 328, also Eur. Hec. p. 121; Plut. l.c.; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 134), when from the connection no doubt can exist as to what city, field, etc. is meant. This omission of the Art., however, is more varied in poetry than in prose (Schaef. Demosth. I. 329).

In the N. T., where in general this omission of the Art. is less frequent than in Greek prose,[1] the following instances of abstracts[2] may be noted: 1 Tim. vi. 11; Rom. i. 29; Col. iii. 8, and in particular δικαιοσύνη Matt. v. 10; Acts x. 35; Rom. viii. 10; Heb. xi. 33, etc., ἀγάπη Gal. v. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 8, πίστις Acts vi. 5; Rom. i. 5; iii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 7; 1 Thess. v. 8, etc., κακία 1 Cor. v. 8; Tit. iii. 3; Jas. i. 21, πλεονεξία 1 Thess. ii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 3, ἁμαρτία Gal. ii. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 1; Rom. iii. 9; vi. 14, etc., σωτηρία Rom. x. 10; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Heb. i. 14; vi. 9. Here belong also, ἀγαθόν Rom. viii. 28 (cf. Fr. in l.), πονηρόν 1 Thess. v. 22, καλόν τε καὶ κακόν Heb. v. 14.

Besides these, we often find in the N. T. without the Article the concretes ἥλιος, γῆ (*Earth*), θεός, πρόσωπον, νόμος, etc., and many others, at least when in connection with prepositions etc. they form phrases of frequent occurrence (Kluit, II. 377; Heindorf, Plat. Gorg. p. 265). We arrange them in the following list, founded on the most approved readings:

ἥλιος (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 467), as in Matt. xiii. 6 ἡλίου ἀνατείλαντος (Polyaen. 6, 5; Lucian. ver. hist. 2, 12; Aelian. 4, 1); particularly when joined as genitive to another noun it expresses *one* idea, as ἀνατολὴ ἡλίου *sunrise* Rev. vii. 2; xvi. 12; (Her. 4, 8), φῶς ἡλίου *sunlight* Rev. xxii. 5 var. (Plat. rep. 5, 473 e.), δόξα ἡλίου *splendor of the sun* 1 Cor. xv. 41; or when the sun is mentioned in an enumeration (in connection with the moon and stars), as Luke xxi. 25 ἔσται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις *in sun, moon, and stars*, Acts xxvii. 20 (Aesch. dial. 3, 17; Plat. Crat. 397 d.).

γῆ, *earth* 2 Pet. iii. 5, 10; Acts xvii. 24, ἐπὶ γῆς Luke ii. 14; 1 Cor.

[1] So we find in Greek authors usually γένει *by nation*, πλήθει, etc., in the N. T. invariably τῷ γένει Acts iv. 36; xviii. 2, 24, also τῷ πλήθει Heb. xi. 12. In Greek authors the omission of the Article before a Nom. even is not unusual, as ἥλιος ἐδύετο Xen. A. 1, 10, 15; Lucian. Scyth. 4; in the N. T., on the contrary, Mark i. 32 ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, Luke iv. 40 δύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου, Eph. iv. 26 ὁ ἥλιος μὴ ἐπιδυέτω. So also in the N. T. never σελήνη in the nominative, and there are more instances of the same kind.

[2] The assertion (*Harless* on Eph. S. 320) that the Article can only be omitted before abstracts when they denote virtues, vices, etc., as properties of a subject, is unproved, and cannot be proved on rational grounds. Cf. also *Krüg.* in *Jahn's* Jahrb. 1838. I. 47

viii. 5; Eph. iii. 15 (Heb. viii. 4), ἀπ' ἄκρου γῆς Mark xiii. 27; cf. Jacobs, Philostr. Imag. p. 266; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 91; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 257. But this word usually has the Art. when it signifies *earth;* in 133
the sense of *land*, on the other hand, the Art. is regularly wanting when 115
the proper name of the country follows, as Matt. xi. 24 γῇ Σοδόμων, [iv. 15] 7th ed.
Acts vii. 29 ἐν γῇ Μαδιάμ, vii. 36 ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου, xiii. 19 ἐν γῇ Χαναάν, etc. 110
(but Matt. xiv. 34 εἰς τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ). See below, 2. b. Van Hengel's 6th ed.
remark on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199 is not to the point.

οὐρανός, οὐρανοί, is seldom without the Article (cf. Jacobs in the Schulzeit. 1831, No. 119, and Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 135): a. In the Gospels only in the phrase ἐν οὐρανῷ, ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἐξ οὐρανῶν, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, but by no means always, even in this case (cf. Matt. vi. 1, 9; xvi. 19; Mark xii. 25; Luke vi. 23, for John except in i. 32 constantly uses ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ); b. By Paul the Art. is regularly omitted in phrases like ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ — van Hengel on 1 Cor. xv. p. 199 — is never used by Paul); in 2 Cor. xii. 2 we find also ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ (Lucian. Philopatr. 12) see b. below, and Peter has even in the Nom. οὐρανοί 2 Pet. iii. 5, 12; c. The Article is never omitted in Rev.

θάλασσα, e.g. Acts x. 6, 32 παρὰ θάλασσαν, Luke xxi. 25 ἠχούσης θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου; cf. Demosth. Aristocr. 450 c.; Diod. S. 1, 32; Dio Chr. 35, 436; 37, 455; Xen. Eph. 5, 10; Arrian. Al. 2, 1, 2, and 3; Held, in Act. Philol. Monac. II. 182 sqq. Even ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ Acts vii. 36; (on the other hand, we find the Art. in Heb. xi. 29). It regularly has the Art., however, when opposed to ἡ γῆ.

μεσημβρία in the phrase κατὰ μεσημβρίαν *southwards* Acts viii. 26, περὶ μεσημβρίαν xxii. 6, cf. Xen. A. 1, 7, 6 πρὸς μεσημβρίαν, Plat. Phaedr. 259 a. ἐν μεσημβρ. So, in general, with the names of the quarters of the heavens, Rev. xxi. 13 ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, ἀπὸ βορρᾶ, ἀπὸ νότου, ἀπὸ δυσμῶν (πρὸς νότον Strabo 16, 719, πρὸς ἑσπέραν D. S. 3, 28, πρὸς ἄρκτον Strabo 15, 715 and 719; 16, 749, πρὸς νότου Plat. Crit. 112 c. βασίλισσα νότου Matt. xii. 42, where, however, it is a sort of proper name), or of a division of the day, as Luke xxiv. 29; Acts xxviii. 23; Krü. 85.

ἀγορά (cf. Bremi, Lys. p. 9; Sintenis, Plutarch. Pericl. p. 80) Mark vii. 4 καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς, ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι. So in Greek authors often, as Her. 7, 223; 3, 104; Lys. Agor. 2; Dion. H. IV. 2117, 6; 2230, 2; Theophr. ch. 19; Plat. Gorg. 447 a.; Lucian. adv. ind. 4 and eunuch. 1, particularly in the phrase πληθούσης ἀγορᾶς Her. 4, 181; Xen. M. 1, 1, 10; Anab. 1, 8, 1; Aelian. 12, 30; D. S. 13, 48 a.

ἀγρός Mark xv. 21 ἐρχόμενον ἀπ' ἀγροῦ (Luke xxiii. 26), Luke xv. 25 ἦν ὁ υἱὸς ἐν ἀγρῷ. Here, however, the word means, not a single definite field (ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγροῦ), but is used generally, *from the country* (as opposed to the town, etc.). So εἰς ἀγρόν Mark xvi. 12, cf. Judg. ix. 27, ἐξ ἀγροῦ Gen. xxx. 16; 1 Sam. xi. 5, etc.; Plat. Theaet. 143 a.; legg. 8, 844 c.

θεός occurs frequently (cf. Hm. Aristoph. nub. v. 816; Bornem. Xen.

conv. p. 142; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 121), and beyond comparison the most frequently in the Epistles, *without* the Art., particularly when it is
134 dependent as a Gen. upon another (anarthrous) noun, as Luke iii. 2; Rom iii. 5; viii. 9; xv. 7, 8, 32; 1 Cor. iii. 16; xi. 7; 2 Cor. i. 12; viii. 5; Eph. v. 5; 1 Thess. ii. 13, in the phrases *θεὸς πατήρ* 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2;
116 Gal. i. 1; Phil. i. 2; ii. 11; 1 Pet. i. 2, *υἱοὶ* or *τέκνα θεοῦ* Matt. v. 9; Rom.
7th ed. viii. 14, 16; Gal. iii. 26; Phil. ii. 15; 1 Jno. iii. 1, 2 (where these nouns
111 are also without the Art.), with Prepositions *ἀπὸ θεοῦ* Jno. iii. 2; xvi. 30;
6th ed. Rom. xiii. 1; 1 Cor. i. 30; vi. 19, *ἐν θεῷ* Jno. iii. 21; Rom. ii. 17, *ἐκ θεοῦ* Acts v. 39; 2 Cor. v. 1; Phil. iii. 9, *κατὰ θεόν* Rom. viii. 27, *παρὰ θεῷ* 2 Thess. i. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 4, also with Adject. 1 Thess. i. 9 *θεῷ ζῶντι καὶ ἀληθινῷ*. (In Jno. i. 1 *θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος* the Art. could not have been omitted if John had intended to designate the *λόγος* as *ὁ θεός*, because in this connection *θεός* alone would be ambiguous. But that John designedly wrote *θεός* is apparent, partly from the distinct antithesis *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* verses 1, 2, and partly from the whole description of the *λόγος*. Similarly stands in 1 Pet. iv. 19 *πιστὸς κτίστης* without the Art.)

πνεῦμα ἅγιον, seldom *πνεῦμα θεοῦ* Acts viii. 15, 17; Rom. viii. 9, 14; Heb. vi. 4; 2 Pet. i. 21; 1 Cor. xii. 3, *πνεῦμα* Phil. ii. 1, also *ἐν πνεύματι* Eph. ii. 22; vi. 18; Col. i. 8, *ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ* Jude 20. (The baptismal formula *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* is cited in Acta Barn. p. 74 thus: *εἰς ὄνομα πατρὸς κ. υἱοῦ κ. ἁγίου πν.*)

πατήρ, Heb. xii. 7 *υἱὸς ὃν οὐ παιδεύει πατήρ*, Jno. i. 14 *μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός*, and in the formula *θεὸς πατὴρ* (*ἡμῶν*); *μήτηρ* only in the phrase *ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός* Matt. xix. 12.

ἀνήρ (*husband*), 1 Tim. ii. 12 *γυναικὶ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός* Eph. v. 23 (but 1 Cor. xi. 3); Luke xvi. 18 *πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ ..... πᾶς ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν*, does not necessarily come under this head, though the first *γυνή* has the Art.; for the last words are to be translated: *he who marries a woman dismissed from a husband*. But in Acts i. 14 one would expect the Art. before *γυναιξί* (see de W.), not so much in Acts xxi. 5; cf., however, above.

πρόσωπον, e.g. Luke v. 12 *πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον*, xvii. 16; 1 Cor. xiv. 25; cf. Sir. l. 17; Tob. xii. 16; Heliod. 7, 8 *ῥίπτει ἑαυτὸν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον*, Achill. Tat. 3, 1; Eustath. amor. Ismen. 7, p. 286 (Heliod. 1, 16), Acts xxv. 16 *κατὰ πρόσωπον*, 2 Cor. x. 7 (Exod. xxviii. 27; xxxix. 13, etc.).

δεξιά, *ἀριστερά*, and the like, in the formulas *ἐκ δεξιῶν* Matt. xxvii. 38; xxv. 33; Luke xxiii. 33, *ἐξ εὐωνύμων* Matt. xx. 21; xxv. 41; Mark x. 37; Krü. 86.

ἐκκλησία, 3 Jno. 6 *οἳ ἐμαρτύρησάν σου τῇ ἀγάπῃ ἐνώπιον ἐκκλησίας*, 1 Cor. xiv. 4 (*ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ* 1 Cor. xiv. 19, 35?).

θάνατος, Matt. xxvi. 38 *ἕως θανάτου* (Sir. xxxvii. 2; li. 6), Phil. ii. 8, 30 *μέχρι θανάτου* (Plat. rep. 2, 361 c.; Athen. 1, 170), Jas. v. 20 *ἐκ θανάτου* (Job v. 20; Prov. x. 2; Plat. Gorg. 511 c.), Luke ii. 26 *μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον*,

Rom. vii. 13 *κατεργαζομένη θάνατον*, i. 32 *ἄξιοι θανάτου*, 2 Cor. iv. 11 *εἰς θάνατον παραδιδόμεθα*, etc.; cf. Himer. 21 *μετὰ θάνατον*, Dion. H. IV. 2112, 135
2242; cf. Grimm, Buch der Weish. S. 26.

θύρα, in the Plur. *ἐπὶ θύραις ad fores* Matt. xxiv. 33; Mark xiii. 29; cf. Plutarch. Themist. 29; Athen. 10, 441; Aristid. Orat. Tom. II. 43 (on the other hand in the Sing. *ἐπὶ τῇ θύρᾳ* Acts v. 9). See Sintenis, Plutarch. Them. p. 181.

νόμος, meaning the *Mosaic law*, Rom. ii. 12, 23; iii. 31; iv. 13, 14, 15; 117
v. 13, 20; vii. 1; x. 4; xiii. 8; 1 Cor. ix. 20; Gal. ii. 21; iii. 11, 18, 21; 7th ed.
iv. 5; Phil. iii. 6; Heb. vii. 12, etc.; always as a Gen. where the prin- 112
cipal noun has no Art.: *ἔργα νόμου*, and the like. (In the Gospels, except 6th ed.
Luke ii. 23, (24,) where, however, a qualifying Gen. follows, we find constantly *ὁ νόμος*.) As to the Apocr., see Wahl, clav. 343. Also cf. Bornem. Acta p. 201.

ῥῆμα, meaning *God's word*, followed by *θεοῦ* Rom. x. 17; Eph. vi. 17; Heb. vi. 5, and without *θεοῦ* Eph. v. 26.

νεκροί, *the dead*, always (except in Eph. v. 14) in the phrases *ἐγείρειν*, *ἐγείρεσθαι*, *ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν* Matt. xvii. 9; Mark vi. 14, 16; ix. 9, 10; xii. 25; Luke ix. 7; xvi. 31; xxiv. 46; Jno. ii. 22; xii. 1, 9, 17; xx. 9; xxi. 14; Acts iii. 15; iv. 2; x. 41; xiii. 30; xxvi. 23; Rom. iv. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 20, etc., and also *ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν* (both without Art.) Acts xvii. 32; xxiv. 21; Rom. i. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 12, 13, 21, 42, etc. Only in Col. ii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 10 is a var. noted. (On the other hand, almost always *ἐγείρεσθαι*, *ἀναστῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν*, Matt. xiv. 2; xxvii. 64; xxviii. 7.) Νεκροί elsewhere designates *dead persons* (Luke vii. 22; 1 Cor. xv. 15, 29, 32, also 1 Pet. iv. 6 etc.), but *οἱ νεκροί*, THE *dead*, as a definitely conceived totality, Jno. v. 21; 1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Cor. i. 9; Col. i. 18.[1] The Greeks, too, regularly omit the Art. before this word.

μέσον, in the phrase (*ἔστησεν*) *ἐν μέσῳ* Jno. viii. 3; Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 126, *εἰς μέσον* Mark xiv. 60 (but *εἰς τὸ μέσον* Jno. xx. 19, 26; Luke iv. 35; vi. 8), *ἐκ μέσου* 2 Thess. ii. 7; more commonly still where a qualifying Gen. follows, Mark vi. 47 *ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης*, Luke viii. 7 *ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀκανθῶν*, Acts xxvii. 27 *κατὰ μέσον τῆς νυκτός* (Theophr. ch. 26). See Wahl, clav. apocr. p. 326.

κόσμος, always in the phrases *ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου* Luke xi. 50; Heb. iv. 3, *πρὸ κατ. κ.* Jno. xvii. 24; 1 Pet. i. 20, *ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου* Rom. i. 20, *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κόσμου* Matt. xxiv. 21; in the Epistles also *ἐν κόσμῳ* Rom. v. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 4; xiv. 10; Phil. ii. 15; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. v. 9. The Nom. is but rarely without the Art., as Gal. vi. 14 *ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται*; and according to the best Codd. Rom. iv. 13 must be read: *κληρονόμον εἶναι κόσμου*.

κτίσις, *creation* (i.e. thing created, the world), in the phrase *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*

[1] The distinction alleged by *van Hengel* on 1 Cor. xv. p. 135 between *νεκροί* and *οἱ νεκροί* has no foundation (either in principle or in usage).

κτίσεως Mark x. 6; xiii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 4. Yet πᾶσα κτίσις 1 Pet. ii. 13;
136 Col. i. 15 (see Mey.) is everywhere distinguished from πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις Mark xvi. 15; Rom. viii. 22; Col. i. 23.

ὥρα, as in 1 Jno. ii. 18 ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστί; particularly with numerals, as ἦν ὥρα τρίτη Mark xv. 25; Jno. xix. 14, περὶ τρίτην ὥραν Matt. xx. 3; Acts x. 9, ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης Mark xv. 33, ἀπὸ ἕκτης ὥρας Matt. xxvii. 45, etc.; cf. D. S. 4, 15; Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 229. (In another relation ὥρα χειμέριος Aelian. 7, 13, ὥρα λουτροῦ Polyaen. 6, 7.) But so with other nouns also when joined to ordinal numerals, as πρώτη φυλακή Heliod. 1, 6; Polyaen. 2, 35; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 152, and ἀπὸ πρώτης ἡμέρας Phil. i. 5.

118 καιρός, in the phrases πρὸ καιροῦ *before the time* Matt. viii. 29; 1 Cor.
7th ed. iv. 5, κατὰ καιρόν Rom. v. 6 (Lucian. Philops. 21) and ἐν καιρῷ Luke xx. 10
113 (Xen. C. 8, 5, 5; Polyb. 2, 45; 9, 12, etc.), also ἐν καιρῷ ἐσχάτῳ 1 Pet. i. 5
6th ed. like ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις 2 Tim. iii. 1; Jas. v. 3.

ἀρχή (Schaef. Demosth. III. 240), especially in the common phrases ἀπ' ἀρχῆς Matt. xix. 8; Acts xxvi. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Jno. i. 1; ii. 7, etc. (Her. 2, 113; Xen. C. 5, 4, 12; Aelian. 2, 4), ἐξ ἀρχῆς Jno. vi. 64; xvi. 4 (Theophr. ch. 28; Lucian. dial. mort. 19, 2, and merc. cond. 1) and ἐν ἀρχῇ Jno. i. 2; Acts xi. 15; (Plat. Phaedr. 245 d.; Lucian. gall. 7). All these regularly in the Sept. also.

κύριος, which in the Gospels usually designates *God* (the O. T. *Lord*, cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 169), and in the Epistles especially Paul's (in accordance with the growth of Christian phraseology) most frequently *Christ*, the *Lord* (Phil. ii. 11; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 24 ff.; Krehl, N. T. Wörterb. S. 360), like θεός often dispenses with the Article, particularly when it is joined to a preposition (chiefly in established phrases like ἐν κυρίῳ) or occurs in the Gen. (1 Cor. vii. 22, 25; x. 21; xvi. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 18; xii. 1) or precedes Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; Gal. i. 3; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; iii. 20). It had already become almost a proper name. It has been erroneously maintained (Gabler, in his neuest. theol. Journ. IV. S. 11–24) that the *meaning* of the word depends on the insertion or omission of the Article. Christ, the Lord, whom all knew as such and who was so often mentioned, the apostles could most easily style κύριος, just as θεός nowhere occurs more frequently without the Article than in the Bible; cf. my Progr. de sensu vocum κύριος et ὁ κύριος in Actis et Epist. Apostolor. Erlang. 1828. 4to. Even in Paul's writings, however, the Article predominates.

διάβολος *the devil*, usually has the Article. Only in 1 Pet. v. 8 we find ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος in apposition, and in Acts xiii. 10 υἱὲ διαβόλου.[1]

[1] Ἄγγελος does not belong to the class of words of which a list is given above. When used in the Sing. without an Article, it always signifies *an angel* (one of the many), and so in the Plur. ἄγγελοι, *angels*, e.g. 1 Tim. iii. 16; Gal. iii. 19, etc.; on the other hand οἱ ἄγγελοι *the angels* as a class of beings. Accordingly 1 Cor. vi. 3 ὅτι ἀγγέλους κρινοῦμεν must be translated, *that we shall judge angels*, — not the angels, the whole multitude of

That appellatives (particularly in the Nom.) are without the Article in titles and superscriptions also, is easily accounted for; cf. Matt. i. 1 *βίβλος γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Mark i. 1 *ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, Rev. i. 1 *ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. 137

2. b. The Article is likewise often omitted before a noun followed by a Gen. designating the singly existing object as something appertaining to this individual [1] (Schaef. Soph. Oed. C. 1468; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 219; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 421; ad Plut. Agid. p. 105; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 277; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 290),[2] e.g. Matt. [xvi. 18 *πύλαι ᾅδου*] xvii. 6 *ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν* cf. xxvi. 39 (Isa. xlix. 23 *ἐπὶ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς*; on the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 67 *εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ*, Rev. vii. 11), Luke i. 51 *ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ*, Rom. i. 1 *εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ* (where Rück. still makes unnecessary difficulties), Eph. i. 20 *ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ* (Heb. i. 3; Matt. xx. 21), Luke xix. 42 *ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου*, 1 Cor. ii. 16 *τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν κυρίου*, 1 Pet. iii. 12, 20; Jas. i. 26; Mark viii. 3; xiii. 27; Rom. i. 20; ii. 5; Luke i. 5; ii. 4, 11; xiii. 19; xix. 13; Heb. xii. 2; 1 Cor. x. 21; xii. 27; xvi. 15; Phil. ii. 16; iv. 3; Eph. i. 4, 6, 12; iv. 30; 1 Thess. v. 8; 2 Thess. i. 9; ii. 2; 2 Pet. ii. 6; iii. 10; Jude 6 (Acts viii. 5), etc. The same occurs very frequently in the Sept. also, as 1 Sam. i. 3, 7; iv. 6; v. 2; Exod. iii. 11; ix. 22; xvii. 1; Cant. v. 1; viii. 2; Judith ii. 7, 14; iii. 3, 9; iv. 11; v. 8; vi. 20; 1 Macc. ii. 50; v. 66; 3 Esr. i. 26. (But in 1 Cor. iv. 14 *ὡς τέκνα μου ἀγαπητά* it was necessary to omit the Article, since the Cor. were not alone *the* beloved children of Paul. In Luke xv. 29 *οὐδέποτε ἐντολήν σου παρῆλθον* means *a command of thine*, but in Acts i. 8 *λήψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* must be translated: *ye shall receive power, when the Holy Ghost shall have descended.*)[3] 119 7th ed. 114 6th ed.

The Article is thus omitted sometimes when a numeral defines

angels, but — angels, who, and as many of them as, fall under the *κρῖσις*. On *νἱοθεσία* Rom. viii. 23, see *Fr.* against *Rückert*. That the word in apposition sometimes has the Article, when the principal noun is anarthrous, has been remarked by *Geel*, ad Dion. Chr. Olymp. p. 70.

[1] Accordingly Jno. v. 1 *ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* could not be translated: *the festival of the Jews* (Passover). The Article, however, has much authority in its favor, and has been admitted into the text by *Tdf.*

[2] The Hebrew language, as is well known, does not in this construction employ an Article before the governing noun. On this *Hengstenberg*, Christol. II. 565, founded a new discovery, which *Lücke* on Jno. v. 1 has suitably appreciated.

[3] *Gersdorf*, I. 316 ff., has not duly distinguished the cases. The Article is both used and omitted in one and the same clause, Luke xxiii. 46 *εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου* etc.

the noun more nearly; as, Acts xii. 10 διελθόντες πρώτην φυλακὴν καὶ δευτέραν, Mark xv. 25 ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, xv. 138 33 ἕως ὥρας ἐννάτης, Luke iii. 1 ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας etc., 2 Cor. xii. 2; Eph. vi. 2 (Phil. i. 5 var.); cf. from Greek authors Lysias 7, 10 τρίτῳ ἔτει, Plato, Min. 319 c. and Hipp. maj. 286 b.; Antiph. 6, 42; Andoc. 4, 17; Diog. L. 7, 135, 138, 141 sqq. (but 7, 150, 151, 153). See above, 1. a. under ὥρα, p. 124.

By this usage may be defended also Matt. xii. 24 ἐν τῷ Βεελζεβοὺλ, ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων, the reading found in all MSS. Fr. (ad Mt. p. 774), without the authority of MSS., substituted ἐν Β. τῷ ἄρχ. etc., as he deemed this omission of the Article strange.

In Greek authors such omission of the Article, especially when the noun is preceded by a preposition, is by no means rare; cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 13 περὶ καταλύσεως τῆς στρατιᾶς, Apol. Socr. 30 ἐν καταλύσει τοῦ βίου, Mem. 120 1, 5, 2 ἐπὶ τελευτῇ τοῦ βίου, 4, 3, 16; Plat. Phaedr. 237 c.; Lys. Agorat. 2 7th ed. ἐπὶ καταλύσει τοῦ δήμου τοῦ ὑμετέρου, and further on πατρίδα σφετέραν αὐτῶν 115 καταλιπόντες, Lucian. Scyth. 4 βίον αὐτῶν, Dio Chr. 38, 471 ὑπὲρ γενέσεως 6th ed. αὐτῆς, Strabo 15, 719 ὑπὸ μήκους τῶν ὁδῶν (17, 808), Thuc. 2, 38 διὰ μέγεθος τῆς πόλεως, 7, 72. So in German, also, the Article is usually omitted after a preposition, e.g. über Auflösung des Räthsels etc. In Greek authors, however, in such cases even the Gen. is frequently anarthrous, or if not, it *precedes*; as, τῶν χωρίων χαλεπότης; cf. Krü. Dion. H. p. 168; Jacobs, Athen. p. 18 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 130. (Xen. C. 8, 6, 16; Mem. 1, 4, 12; Thuc. 1, 1; 6, 34; 8, 68).

3. c. When several consecutive nouns[1] connected by *καί* and denoting different objects[2] *agree* in case and number, each of them regularly takes the Article if they *differ* in gender; — not merely when they signify persons, as Acts xiii. 50 τὰς σεβομένας γυναῖκας ... καὶ τοὺς πρώτους τῆς πόλεως (Luke xiv. 26; Eph. vi. 2; Acts xxvi. 30), but also inanimate objects Col. iv. 1 τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὴν ἰσότητα τοῖς δούλοις παρέχεσθε, Rom. viii. 2 ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου, Matt. xxii. 4; Luke x. 21; Rom. xvi. 17; Phil. iv. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 4; Eph. ii. 1; Rev. i. 2; xiv. 7; Heb. iii. 6; cf. Xen. C. 2, 2, 9 σὺν τῷ θώρακι κ. τῇ κοπίδι, Plut. virt. mul. p. 210 διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα κ. τὴν ἀρετήν, Dion. H. IV. 2245, 4 ἐπὶ τοῦ τόκου καὶ

[1] *Benseler*, Isocr. Areopag. p. 290 sqq., has collected much from Isocrates on the repetition and the non-repetition of the Article with connected nouns (Subst. Adject. Particip. also Infin.), but without throwing entire light on the subject. Cf. also *Tholuck*, Literar. Anzeig. 1837, No. 5.

[2] For a repetition of the Article is not admissible before connected nouns which, for instance, are merely predicates of one and the same person, as in Col. iii. 17 τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρί, 2 Pet. i. 11 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰ. Χρ., Eph. vi. 21; Mark vi. 3; Acts iii. 14.

τῆς λοχείας, 2117, 17 τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ τὰ ὅπλα, 2089, 14; D. S. 1, 50, 51, 86; Philostr. her. 3, 2; Diog. L. 3, 18; 5, 51; Herod. 2, 10, 15; Strabo 3, 163; 15, 712; Plutarch. aud. poët. 9 in. and Themist. 8; Isocr. Areop. p. 334; Plat. Charm. p. 160 b.; Sext. Emp. adv. 139
Math. 2, 58.

In these connections the repetition of the Article appeared *grammatically* necessary, while at the same time the ideas connected are mostly such as require to be grasped separately. See under 4.

Where, however, the ideas do not require to be sharply distinguished, or where an adjective is joined to the first noun and to be extended also to the second, the repetition of the Article does not take place even when the nouns differ in gender; and the *one* Article that precedes serves alike for all the nouns that follow; as, Col. ii. 22 τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Luke xiv. 23 ἔξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμούς, i. 6 ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς καὶ δικαιώμασι τοῦ κυρίου, Mark xii. 33; Rev. v. 12.

Such passages are to be found likewise in Greek authors, — and 121
far more frequently indeed, — in poetry (Hm. Eurip. Hec. p. 76) 7th ed.
as well as in prose, without any very precise reference to the sense, e.g. Plat. rep. 9. 586 d. τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ λόγῳ, legg. 6, 784 ὁ σωφρονῶν 116
καὶ σωφρονοῦσα, 6. 510 c.; apol. 18 a.; Crat. 405 d.; Aristot. anal. 6th ed.
post. 1, 26; Thuc. 1, 54; Lycurg. 30; Lucian. parasit. 13; Herod. 8, 6, 11; Ael. anim. 5, 26; cf. also Krü. Dion. p. 140, and Xen. Anab. p. 92, Bornem. Cyrop. p. 668.

When such nouns are disjoined by ἤ, the Article is invariably repeated; as, Matt. xv. 5 τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί, Mark iv. 21 ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην, Rev. xiii. 17.

When the connected nouns differ in number the repetition of the Article is naturally and grammatically almost indispensable; as, Col. ii. 13 ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ, Eph. ii. 3 τὰ θελήματα τῆς σαρκὸς καὶ τῶν διανοιῶν, 1 Tim. v. 23; Tit. ii. 12; Acts xv. 4, 20; xxviii. 17; Matt. v. 17; Rev. ii. 19. Cf. Plato, Crito 47 c. τὴν δόξαν καὶ τοὺς ἐπαίνους, Dion. H. IV. 2238, 1 ὑπὸ τῆς παρθένου καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὴν γυναικῶν. Yet Xen. A. 2, 1, 7 ἐπιστήμων τῶν περὶ τὰς τάξεις τε καὶ ὁπλομαχίαν, Agath. 14, 12 τὰς δυνάμεις καὶ πόλεμον. But 1 Cor. iv. 9 θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἀγγέλοις καὶ ἀνθρώποις does not come under this head; the last two nouns without the Art. particularize the τῷ κόσμῳ: *the world, — angels as well as men.*

4. d. If, however, such nouns connected by καί are of the *same* gender, the Article is *omitted*

1) When the connected nouns are regarded as only parts of one whole, or members of one community (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex.

p. 253 ; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 455) ; as, Mark xv. 1 *συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς μετὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ γραμματέων* 140 (where the elders and scribes are designated as only *one* class of individuals, in distinction from the high priests), Luke xiv. 3, 21 ; Col. ii. 8, 19 ; Eph. ii. 20 ; v. 5 ; Phil. i. 7 ; ii. 17 ; Acts xxiii. 7 ; 2 Pet. i. 10 (Xen. A. 2, 2, 5 ; 3, 1, 29 ; Plat. Phil. 28 e. ; Dion. H. IV. 2235, 5 ; Plutarch. aud. poët. 1 in. 12 in.).

2) When between the first noun and its Article a Gen. or some other attributive interveñes, which also qualifies the second ; as, 1 Thess. ii. 12 *εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν*, iii. 7 *ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει καὶ ἀνάγκῃ ἡμῶν*, Rom. i. 20 *ἥ τε ἀΐδιος αὐτοῦ δύναμις καὶ θειότης*, Phil. i. 25 ; Eph. iii. 5. Cf. Dion. H. IV. 2246, 9 *τὰς αὑτῶν γυναῖκας καὶ θυγατέρας*, 2089, 4 ; D. S. 1, 86 *τὴν προειρημένην ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τιμήν*, 2, 18 ; Ael. anim. 7, 29 ; Aristot. eth. Nicom. 4, 1, 9 ; 7, 7, 1.[1] So also when the common Genitive follows the second noun ; as, Phil. i. 20 *κατὰ τὴν ἀποκαραδοκίαν καὶ ἐλπίδα* 122 *μου*, i. 7 *ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ κ. βεβαιώσει τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, 1 Pet. ii. 25 7th ed. (on Phil. i. 19 see Mey.). Cf. Benseler p. 293 sq.

Under 1. it should be noted, that in a series of nouns forming a *single* category, only the first has the Article ; as, Acts xxi. 25 *φυλάσσεσθαι αὐτοὺς ... τὸ αἷμα καὶ πνικτὸν καὶ πορνείαν*, Eph. iii. 18 *τί τὸ πλάτος κ. μῆκος κ. βάθος* 117 *κ. ὕψος*, Jno. v. 3 ; 1 Cor. v. 10 ; cf. Her. 4, 71 *θάπτουσι καὶ τὸν οἰνοχόον κ.* 8th ed. *μάγειρον κ. ἱπποκόμον κ. διήκονον κ. ἀγγελιηφόρον*, etc. ; Plato, Euthyph. p. 7 c. For instances with proper names, see Acts i. 13 ; xv. 23.

5. On the other hand, the Article is *used* in the case under consideration, commonly

a. When each of the connected nouns is to be regarded as independent (Schaef. Dem. V. 501 ; Weber, Dem. 268), 1 Cor. iii. 8 *ὁ φυτεύων καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἕν εἰσιν*, Acts xxvi. 30 *ἀνέστη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὁ ἡγεμών*, etc., Mark ii. 16 *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* (two separate classes of Christ's adversaries combined for one object), Jno. xix. 6 *οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται the high priests and the* (subordinate) *attendants* (with their attendants), ii. 14 ; xi. 47 ; Mark ii. 18 ; vi. 21 ; xi. 9, 18, 27 ; xii. 13 ; xiii. 17 ; xiv. 43 ; Luke i. 58 ; viii. 24 ; xi. 39, 42 ; xii. 11 ; xv. 6, 9 ; xx. 20 ; xxi. 23 ; xxiii. 4 ; Acts iv. 23 ; vi. 4, 13 ; xiii. 43 ; xv. 6 ; xxiii. 14 ; xxv. 15 ; Rom. vi. 19 ; Eph. iii. 10, 12 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 2 ; Phil. iv. 6 ; 1 Tim. iv. 6 ; Jas. iii. 11 ; 1 Jno. ii. 22, 24 ; iv. 6 ; v. 6 ; Rev. vi. 15 ; vii. 12 ; xiii. 10, 16 ; xxii. 1 ; cf. Xen. athen. 1, 4 ; Lys. Agorat. 2 ;

[1] In this case, even when the nouns are of different gender, as in Lysias in Andoc. 17 *περὶ τὰ ἀλλότρια ἱερὰ καὶ ἑορτὰς ἠσέβει*. Cf. above, 3.

adv. Nicom. 3; Isocr. Areop. p. 352; permut. 736; D. S. 1, 30 141
(*διὰ τὴν ἀνυδρίαν καὶ τὴν σπάνιν τῆς ἀπάσης τροφῆς*) 3, 48; 5, 29; 17, 52; Plut. virt. mul. p. 214 *ἔπεμψε τὴν γυναῖκα κ. τὴν θυγατέρα*, Ael. anim. 7, 29; Diog. L. 5, 52;[1] Weber, Demosth. p. 395.

So especially when the two nouns are connected by *τε ... καί* or *καὶ ... καί*, and thus more prominently exhibited as independent (Schaef. Demosth. III. 255; IV. 68) Luke xxiii. 12; Acts v. 24; xvii. 10, 14; xviii. 5; Phil. iii. 10; Heb. ix. 2; cf. Ael. anim. 7, 29; Theophr. char. 25 (16); Thuc. 5, 72; Xen. C. 7, 5, 41; Mem. 1, 1, 4; Aristot. pol. 3, 5; Isocr. Demon. p. 1 and 12; permut. 738; D. S. 1, 69; 4, 46; Lucian. fug. 4; Arrian. Ind. 34, 5, etc. Even in this case, however, if there be no special antithesis Greek authors (according to good Codd.) sometimes omit the Article; see Poppo, Thuc. I. 196 sq.; III. I. 395; Geel, Dion. Chr. Or. p. 295; cf. Xen. M. 1, 1, 19 *τά τε λεγόμενα καὶ πραττόμενα* (where, as an antithesis to these two participles, immediately follows *καὶ τὰ σιγῇ βουλευόμενα*) Thuc. 5, 37; Plat. rep. 6, 510 c. and Phaed. 123
78 b.; Dion. H. IV. 2242, 2; Diod. S. 1, 50; 2, 30; Arrian. Ind. 7th ed.
5, 1; Dio Chr. 7, 119; Mr. Ant. 5, 1. Cf. also Mtth. 715.

When the influence of a *disjunctive* particle comes in, the repetition of the Article is obviously necessary; as, Luke xi. 51 *μεταξὺ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου*, Matt. xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xiv. 7 *πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον ἢ τὸ κιθαριζόμενον;* Matt. x. 14; xvii. 25; xxiii. 17, 19; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xiii. 15; xxii. 27; Jno. iii. 19; Acts xxviii. 17; Rom. iv. 9; 1 Cor. xiv. 5. Cf. Isocr. permut. 118
p. 746. 6th ed.

b. When the first noun is followed by a Gen., and the second, therefore, is appended to an independent group; as, 1 Cor. i. 28 *τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα*, v. 10.

If each of the connected nouns has its Genitive, the repetition of the Article before the second noun is unnecessary, since the two nouns are separated without it; as, Phil. i. 19 *διὰ τῆς ὑμῶν δεήσεως καὶ ἐπιχορηγίας τοῦ πνεύματος*, etc.

Note 1. Variants occur in a very great number of passages, e.g. Matt. xxvii. 3; Mark viii. 31; x. 33; xi. 15; Luke xxii. 4; Acts xvi. 19; Rom. iv. 2, 11, 19; 1 Cor. xi. 27; 1 Thess. i. 8.

[1] We find the Article both used and omitted before nouns of the same gender in *Arrian.* Epict. I, 18, 6 *τὴν ὄψιν τὴν διακριτικὴν τῶν λευκῶν καὶ μελάνων ... τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν κακῶν.* Somewhat differently in Acts vi. 9 *τινὲς τῶν ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῆς λεγομένης Λιβερτίνων καὶ Κυρην. καὶ Ἀλεξανδρ., καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας*, where *Κυρην.* and *Ἀλεξ.* combined with *Λιβερτ.* constitute *one* party (with a synagogue in common), as the other synagogue corporation was formed of the Asiatic and Cilician Jews.

Moreover, the view taken of the mutual relation of the connected nouns
142 may frequently be a matter of indifference; it depends upon the writer how he will regard it; (in 1 Thess. i. 7 we find ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ but in 8 καὶ Ἀχαΐᾳ). Hence there are passages where the reader would not miss the Article, e.g. 1 Tim. v. 5;[1] while in others it might perhaps be used, as in Eph. ii. 20 (Mey. in l.). See in general, Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 253; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 395.

In Tit. ii. 13 ἐπιφάνεια τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χρ., for reasons which lie in the doctrinal system of Paul, I do not regard σωτῆρος as a second predicate by the side of θεοῦ, as if Christ were first styled ὁ μέγας θεός and then σωτήρ. The Article is omited before σωτῆρος, because the word is made definite by the Genitive ἡμῶν, and the apposition *precedes* the proper name: *of the great God and of our Saviour Jesus Christ.*[2] Similar is 2 Pet. i. 1, where there is not even a pronoun with σωτῆρος. So
124 also in Jude 4 two different subjects may be referred to, since κύριος, as
7th ed. made definite by ἡμῶν, does not require the Article in order to mean Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ὅς ἐστι κύριος ἡμῶν. (In 2 Thess, i. 12 we have simply an instance of κύριος for ὁ κύριος.)

119 Note 2. The omission of the Article in Luke x. 29 τίς ἐστί μου πλησίον,
6th ed. and 36 τίς τούτων ... πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπ., seems strange, as one would have expected ὁ πλησίον (see Markland, Eur. Suppl. 110), since, moreover, πλησίον is an adverb. A similar instance has been quoted by Döderlein (Synon. I. 59) from Aeschyl. Prom. 938 ἐμοὶ δ' ἔλασσον Ζηνὸς ἢ μηδὲν μέλλει, where μηδέν appears to be put for τοῦ μηδέν. In both the passages from Luke, however, the adverb also is allowable: *who is near me?* See Bornem. in l.

[1] As the words run: προσμένει ταῖς δεήσεσι καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς, prayer is distributed into its two kinds; without the repetition of the Article, prayer and petitions would be blended into one.

[2] In the above remarks I did not mean to deny that σωτῆρος ἡμῶν can *grammatically* be regarded as a second predicate dependent on the Article τοῦ; only, doctrinal conviction, deduced from Paul's teaching, that this apostle could not have called Christ *the great God*, induced me to show that there is also no grammatical obstacle to taking καὶ σωτ. ... Χριστοῦ by itself as a second subject. Since the anonymous writer in *Tholuck's* Liter. Anzeiger (as referred to) has not proved that, according to my acceptation of the passage the Article *must* have been repeated before σωτῆρος (the passages quoted as parallel are not analogous, see *Fr.* Rom. II. 268), still less that to introduce Christ as ὁ μέγας θεός is in harmony with Paul's representation of the relation of Christ to God, I adhere to the above interpretation. Examples, such as those quoted § 19, 2, will at once satisfy the impartial inquirer that the Article was *not* necessary before σωτῆρος; and the fact that *elsewhere* σωτήρ is applied also to God, is nothing to the purpose. Enough that σωτὴρ ἡμῶν *our Saviour* is a perfectly definite predicate, just as *his face* is; πρόσωπον is applicable to a far greater number of individuals than σωτήρ. The words S. 38: *If the expression σωτὴρ ἡμῶν invariably occurred in the N. T. of a single definite individual only* etc. contain an arbitrary assumption. *Matthies* has contributed to the discussion nothing decisive.

§ 20. ARTICULUS PRAEPOSITIVUS, b. WITH ATTRIBUTIVES.

1. Attributives (Adjectives, Genitives, or Adjuncts formed with Prepositions[1]) annexed to a noun which has the Article, are placed either

a. Between the Article and the noun, as ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος Matt. xii. 35, τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα Matt. xviii. 20, τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, ἡ τοῦ 143
θεοῦ μακροθυμία 1 Pet. iii. 20, ἡ ἄνω κλῆσις Phil. iii. 14, ἡ ἐν φόβῳ ἁγνὴ ἀναστροφή 1 Pet. iii. 2, ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη Rom. xi. 27, ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις ix. 11, τὸ καινὸν αὐτοῦ μνημεῖον Matt. xxvii. 60; cf. 2 Pet. ii. 7; Heb. v. 14; vi. 7. Or,

b. After the noun; in which case

α. If they are adjectives,[2] or adjuncts with prepositions, they uniformly take the repeated Article, but

β. If Genitives of nouns, they usually take it only *αα.* when these additions are to be strengthened, or to be made more promi- 125
nent (1 Cor. i. 18 ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, Tit. ii. 10 τὴν διδασκαλίαν 7th ed.
τὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν; see Schaef. Melet. p. 8, 72 sq.; Mtth. 727),[3] particularly when relationship is added for *distinction's* sake, as Jno. xix. 25 *Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ*,[4] Acts xiii. 22 *Δαβὶδ ὁ τοῦ Ἰεσσαί*,

[1] Genitives of personal pronouns are joined to nouns, as is well known, without the aid of the Article, as ὁ παῖς μου. They blend, as it were, with the substantive.

[2] It is obvious that this applies only to adjectives used as attributives to substantives. In Luke xxiii. 45 ἐσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον, the word μέσον belongs to the verb: *was rent ... in the middle;* τὸ μέσον καταπέτασμα would have a different meaning. So the similar adjectives of space or number ἔσχατος, ὅλος, μόνος, ὀλίγος always appear without the Article when they are not really epithets, — either a. *after* the noun, as Matt. xvi. 26 ἐὰν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ *if he gain the whole world* (the world wholly), x. 30 αἱ τρίχες τ. κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἠριθμημέναι εἰσίν (ix. 35; Jno. v. 22; Plato, epin. 983 a.), Matt. xii. 4 οὐκ ἐξὸν ἦν φαγεῖν ... εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν μόνοις; or b. *before* it, Matt. iv. 23; Heb. ix. 7 μόνος ὁ ἀρχιερεύς, Jno. vi. 22; see *Gersdorf*, I. 371 ff., who has collected examples with little judgment. Cf. *Jacob*, Lucian. Al. p. 51; *Krü.* 104 f.; *Rost*, S. 435.

[3] *Stallb.* Plat. Gorg. p. 55; *Mdv.* p. 12. This construction, however, gradually lost its force, and many authors almost invariably put the Article before such a Genitive even when no emphasis is intended. So, in particular, Demosth., Isocr. and Xen. Ephes. The orators might have some reason for this in *spoken* discourse. Cf. *Siebelis*, Pausan. I. 17.

[4] The precise meaning of the above is: among the women called Mary, the (particular one) of Clopas (the wife of Clopas). The Article is *not* used where the annexed Genitive is not intended to convey any sharp distinction, as Luke vi. 16 Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου, Acts i. 13 Ἰάκωβος Ἀλφαίου, just as Her. 1, 59 Λυκοῦργος Ἀριστολαΐδεω and Dion. H. comp. 1 Διονυσίου Ἀλεξάνδρου (in both passages, however, *Schaef.* would insert the Article), or Aristot. polit. 2, 6 Ἱππόδαμος Εὐρυφῶντος, and Thuc. 1, 24 Φάλιος Ἐρατοκλείδου (*Poppo*, Thuc. I. 195), *Thilo*, Act. Thom. p. 3; cf. *Hm.* Vig. 701. On the other hand, in Luke xxiv. 10 we must unhesitatingly read, with the most approved MSS., Μαρία ἡ

120 Matt. iv. 21; x. 2; Mark iii. 17; *ββ.* when the noun has already
6th ed. its (personal) Genitive, as Matt. xxvi. 28 *τὸ αἷμά μου τὸ τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης*, yet the Art. here is not quite established.

c. Rarely such attributives, particularly if adjectives, are put *before* the noun and its Article; as, Acts xxvi. 24 *μεγάλῃ τῇ φωνῇ ἔφη* see above § 18, Matt. iv. 23 *περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.*

144 In case a. more than one attributive may be inserted between the Article and the noun; as, *ὁ ἅγιος καὶ ἄμωμος ἄνθρωπος.* The Article then is usually not repeated. With qualifying Genitives or adjuncts appended by means of Prepositions, there are instances of the repetition of the Article; as, Luke i. 70 *διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν*, 1 Pet. iv. 14 *τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα*, i.e. *the Spirit of glory and* (consequently) *the Spirit of God*, — the Spirit of glory, which is no other than the Spirit of God himself. Similar is Thuc. 1, 126 *ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τῇ μεγίστῃ ἑορτῇ*, and Plat. rep. 8, 565 d. *περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερόν*, only that *καί* is wanting here.

In case b. also, there is no objection to the accumulation of adjuncts, as Heb. xi. 12 *ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης, ἡ ἀναρίθμητος*, Rev. ii. 12 *τὴν ῥομφαίαν τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν*, Krü. 102; except that when the last are not connected by *καί* (§ 19, 4) the Article must be repeated.[1]

It will be necessary to explain here more minutely, and to confirm by examples, the case b. *α.*

126 a. Adjectives and possessive pronouns with the Article are
7th ed. placed after the noun, either

Quite alone, as Jno. x. 11 *ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός*, Acts xii. 10 *ἐπὶ τὴν πύλην τὴν σιδηρᾶν*, Jno. vii. 6 *ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμός*, i. 9; iv. 11; xv. 1; Luke ii. 17; iii. 22; viii. 8; Acts xix. 16; Eph. vi. 13; Col. i. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 7; 1 Cor. vii. 14; xii. 2, 31; 1 Jno. i. 3; Jas. i. 9; iii. 7 (in which case the adjective sometimes is subjoined for greater perspicuity, cf. particularly Jas. iii. 7, sometimes is to be made more emphatic, Bornem. Luc. p. xxxvi.; Mdv. 11). Or

When the governing noun is amplified by a Gen. or in some other way, as Matt. iii. 17 *ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός*, 2 Cor. vi. 7 *διὰ τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν*, Jno. vi. 13 *τῶν πέντε ἄρτων τῶν κριθίνων*, Matt. vi. 6; Luke vii. 47; Tit. ii. 11;

Ἰακώβου. In general cf. *Fr.* Mr. p. 696 sq. The collocation of words in Pausan. 2. 22, 6 *τῆς Φορώνεως Νιόβης* does not occur in the N. T.

[1] A rare repetition of the Article, in accordance with the above rules, occurs in Rev. xxi. 9 *ἦλθεν εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἐχόντων τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας (τὰς) γεμούσας (τῶν) ἑπτὰ πληγῶν τῶν ἐσχάτων.*

Heb. xiii. 20, etc. (The N. T. writers liked to avoid the construction *τὸν μονογ. θεοῦ υἱόν* as intricate; cf. Jno. iii. 16; 1 Jno. iv. 9.)

In the text. rec. of 1 Jno. v. 20 *ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος* we find the adj. 121
without the Article after the noun. The better Codd., however, 6th ed.
omit the Article before *ζωή* also. The common reading in itself considered is by no means to be rejected, as in such cases later writers begin to omit the Article (Bhdy. S. 323),[1] although the examples from Long. past. 1, 16; Heliod. 7, 5; Diod. S. 5, 40 are 145
not quite parallel to that from John. Besides, *ζωὴ αἰών.* had already come to be regarded as a *single* idea, cf. Jno. iv. 36. In Luke xii. 12, Griesb. and Schott have *τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, but Knapp and all recent editors give *τὸ γὰρ ἅγιον πνεῦμα*, without noting any variants. In 1 Cor. x. 3; Gal. i. 4 *τὸ βρῶμα πνευματικόν* and *ὁ αἰὼν πονηρός* are to be considered as blending together into *one* leading idea; and *αὐτό* and *ἐνεστ.*, as frequently, have been inserted as epithets between the Article and the Substantive; cf. 1 Pet. i. 18. See also Heb. ix. 1 *τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν*. With Jno. v. 36 *ἐγὼ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου* (a predicate: *the* witness that I have is greater than, etc., Rost 435) may be compared Isocr. Philipp. c. 56 *τὸ σῶμα θνητὸν ἅπαντες ἔχομεν*. Further, cf. Schaef. Plut. V. 30.

b. The Article is used with subjoined amplifications of the principal noun consisting of a noun and preposition: 1 Thess. i. 8 *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, 2 Cor. viii. 4 *τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους*, Jas. i. 1 *ταῖς φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*, Acts xv. 23 *τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν ... ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν*, xxiv. 5 *πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην*, iii. 16; iv. 2; viii. 1; xi. 22; xxvi. 4, 12, 22; xxvii. 5; Mark iv. 31; xiii. 25; Jno. i. 46; Luke xx. 35; Rom. iv. 11; vii. 5, 10; viii. 39; x. 5; xiv. 19; xv. 26, 31; xvi. 1; 1 Cor. ii. 11 f.; iv. 17; xvi. 1; 2 Cor. ii. 6; vii. 12; ix. 1; xi. 3; Phil. i. 11; iii. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 1; iv. 10; 1 Tim. i. 14; 2 Tim. ii. 1; Eph. i. 15; Rev. xiv. 17; xvi. 12; xix. 14; xx. 13. (Variants occur in Acts xx. 21; Luke v. 7; Jno. xix. 38; Rom. x. 1.) For examples from Arrian (yet the like are to be found in every page of the Greek prose authors) see Ellendt, Arrian 127
Al. I. 62. 7th ed.

This mode of annexing an attributive (by bringing it in afterwards), as the more simple, is far more frequent in the N. T. than the insertion of it between the Article and the noun. The LXX.

[1] According to the testimony of good Codd. even the earlier writers in certain cases did the same; cf. *Schneider*, Plat. civ. II. 319, and *Krü.* in *Jahn's* Jahrb. 1838. I. 61.

also, as a slight inspection will show, have regularly observed the use of the Art. in this case.

c. Participles, as attributives, in as far as they have not entirely dropped the notion of time, are not treated in this case altogether like adjectives. They take the Article only when some relation already known or especially noteworthy (*is, qui, quippe qui*) is indicated, and consequently the idea expressed by the participle
146 is to be made more prominent, e.g. 1 Pet. v. 10 *ὁ θεὸς ... ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ δόξαν ... ὀλίγον παθόντας, αὐτὸς καταρτίσαι God ... who hath called us unto his eternal glory, ... after that we have suffered a while* etc., Eph. i. 12 *εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς εἰς ἔπαινον τοὺς προηλπικότας ἐν τῷ Χρ. we, the we who (quippe qui)*
122 *have hoped* (as those who have hoped), cf. vs. 19; Heb. iv. 3; vi. 18;
6th ed. Rom. viii. 4; 1 Cor. viii. 10; Jno. i. 12; 1 Jno. v. 13; 1 Thess. i. 10; iv. 5; 1 Pet. i. 3; iii. 5; Jas. iii. 6; Acts xxi. 38; cf. Dion. H. III. 1922; Polyb. 3, 45, 2; 3, 48, 6; Lucian. dial. m. 11, 1 a.

On the other hand, the participle occurs *without* the Article in Acts xxiii. 27 *τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλληφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων hunc virum comprehensum* (who was seized, after he had been seized), 2 Cor. xi. 9 *ὑστέρημά μου προσανεπλήρωσαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας the brethren, after they had arrived*, Acts iii. 26 *ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτόν*, etc., *God, having raised up* (causing to appear) *his Son, sent him*, etc. (on the other hand, Heb. xiii. 20), Rom. ii. 27 *κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σέ* etc., *if* or *thereby that it fulfils* etc. Cf. Luke xvi. 14; Jno. iv. 6, 39, 45; 1 Cor. i. 7; xiv. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Heb. x. 2; xii. 23; 1 Pet. i. 12 (Fr. Mt. p. 432; Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 14). So Acts xxi. 8 *εἰς τὸν οἶκον Φιλίππου τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ ὄντος ἐκ τῶν ἑπτά* is to be translated: *qui erat*, as being one of the seven (yet some authorities give *τοῦ* here, which introduces into the passage a false emphasis), Rom. xvi. 1 cf. Demosth. Con. 728 c. *Εὐξίθεον τουτονὶ ὄνθ' ἡμῖν συγγενῆ*, D. S. 17, 38 *ὁ παῖς ὢν ἐξ ἐτῶν*, 3, 23 *τὸν πίπτοντα καρπὸν ὄντα καλόν*, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16 *ἐν τῇ νήσῳ ἀνύδρῳ οὔσῃ πρότερον*, Thuc. 4, 3; 8, 90; Demosth. Polycl. 710 b.: Isocr. Trap. 870; Lucian. Hermot. 81; dial. m. 10, 9; Alciphr. 3, 18; Strabo, 3, 164; Long. 2, 2; Philostr. Her. 3, 4 and Sophist. 1, 23, 1.

In Eph. vi. 16 *τὰ βέλη τὰ πεπυρωμένα* the Article is not fully established (Lchm. has cancelled it); if it is not genuine, the meaning of the passage is: *the darts, when they burn*, or *though they burn* (to quench the darts of Satan ... burning as they are). In 2 Jno. 7 *ἐρχόμενον* belongs to the

predicate; and in Gal. iii. 1 Ἰησοῦς Χρ. προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος is to be translated: *Jesus Christ as one who has been crucified;* cf. 1 Cor. i. 23; (otherwise in Matt. xxviii. 5). 128 7th ed.

The above passage, 1 Pet. v. 10, ὁ θεός, ὁ καλέσας ἡμᾶς ... ὀλίγον παθόντας is peculiarly instructive respecting the use and the omission of the Article with Participles. Whether the Article is to be used or omitted before the Participle, depends sometimes on the subjective view of the writer. 147
Rom. viii. 1 τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν etc., with a comma after Ἰησοῦ, means: *to those who are in Christ Jesus, inasmuch as they walk not after the flesh.* On the other hand, τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, with greater prominence of the apposition, means: *to those who are in Christ Jesus, as persons who walk not* etc., *to those who walk not* etc.; cf. Mtth. 718. The whole clause, however, μὴ ... πνεῦμα is undoubtedly spurious.

When a Participle with the Article is subjoined in apposition to a noun, or put in the Vocative (as if in apposition to σύ), it sometimes denotes ridicule or disapprobation, or prominently points out some peculiarity as a subject of ridicule or disapprobation. Expositors of Greek authors have frequently attributed to the Article itself a derisive force (*articulus irrisioni inservit*, Valcken. Eur. Phoen. 1637; Markland, Eurip. Suppl. 110; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 12, and Apol. p. 70); this, however, lies only in the *thought* and its special prominence (and in speaking may also be conveyed by the voice). Here, for instance, may be referred from the N. T. Rom. ii. 1 τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων, Matt. xxvii. 40 ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν ... κατάβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ [Jno. v. 12] etc. See Hm. Eur. Alcest. 708; Mtth. 722. 123 6th ed.

2. To the rule explained under b. there are unquestionable — indeed, well-nigh standing — exceptions, viz.

When an adjunct (consisting of a noun and preposition) which in reality forms with the substantive but one leading idea, is to be linked to the preceding noun simply by the voice, the grammatical connective of the written language (i.e. the Article) is wanting, e.g. Col. i. 8 δηλώσας ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην ἐν πνεύματι *your love in the Spirit*, see Huther, 1 Cor. x. 18 βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα (opp. to Ἰσρ. κατὰ πνεῦμα), 2 Cor. vii. 7 τὸν ὑμῶν ζῆλον ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, Eph. ii. 11. This takes place especially,

a. In the oft-recurring apostolic (Pauline) phrase, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, or ἐν κυρίῳ, or κατὰ σάρκα, as Col. i. 4 ἀκούσαντες τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Eph. i. 15 ἀκούσας τὴν καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστιν ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰ. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους, Rom. ix. 3 τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα, 1 Thess. iv. 16 οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον *the dead in Christ* (1 Cor. xv. 18), with which in vs. 17 is contrasted ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, for these are ζῶντες ἐν Χριστῷ (of the resurrection of

non-Christians Paul has here no occasion to speak), Phil. iii. 14; Eph. iv. 1 (where Paul, if ἐν κυρίῳ is to be connected with παρακαλῶ, would have placed this latter word after ὑμᾶς; δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ
129 gives the proper emphasis to the admonition that follows), ii. 21;
7th ed. vi. 21. Not unlike this is 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ
148 Θεσσαλονικέων ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ καὶ κυρίῳ, etc. Likewise in 1 Tim. vi. 17 τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐν τῷ νῦν αἰῶνι[1] are to be connected. Cf. besides, Acts xxvi. 4; Rom. xvi. 3, 8, 10; Eph. ii. 15; Phil. i. 1.

b. When the primitive verb was construed with a particular preposition, or when the adjunct is half-implied in the noun (Held, Plut. Timol. p. 419; Krü. 103), as Eph. iii. 4 δύνασθε νοῆσαι τὴν σύνεσίν μου ἐν τῷ μυστηρίῳ (Josh. i. 7; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 12; Esr. i. 31) cf. Dan. i. 4 συνιέντες ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ; Rom. vi. 4 συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον (vs. 3 ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ), Phil. i. 26 διὰ τῆς ἐμῆς παρουσίας πάλιν πρὸς ὑμᾶς,[2] 2 Cor. ix. 13 ἁπλότητι τῆς κοινωνίας εἰς αὐτοὺς καὶ εἰς πάντας, Col.
124 i. 12 (Job xxx. 19) cf. Bähr in loc.; Eph. iii. 13 ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί
6th ed. μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (cf. vs. 1), 2 Cor. i. 6; Col. i. 24. So Polyb. 3, 48, 11 τὴν τῶν ὄχλων ἀλλοτριότητα πρὸς Ῥωμαίους, D. S. 17, 10 τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου παρουσίας ἐπὶ τὰς Θήβας, Her. 5, 108 ἡ ἀγγελία περὶ τῶν Σαρδίων, Thuc. 5, 20 ἡ ἐσβολὴ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικήν 2, 52 ἡ συγκομιδὴ ἐκ τῶν ἀγρῶν εἰς τὸ ἄστυ 1, 18; Plutarch. Coriol. 24 ἡ τῶν πατρικίων δυσμένεια πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, and Pomp. 58 αἱ παρακλήσεις ὑπὲρ Καίσαρος. From the LXX. compare Exod. xvi. 7 τὸν γογγυσμὸν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ, which Thiersch considers as *paene vitiosum!*

Case a. is to be referred no doubt to the colloquial language, which, having the more expressive aid of the voice, scarcely employed the Article anywhere; whereas the literary language, for the sake of precision, could less easily dispense with it. Yet from the literary language a few instances even of this omission of the Article may be produced; cf. Polyb. 5, 64, 6 διὰ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς δόξαν ἐκ τῆς ἀθλήσεως, Sext. Emp. hypot. 3, 26 ζητοῦμεν περὶ τοῦ τόπου πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν for τοῦ πρὸς ἀ., as appears from what precedes, Thuc. 6, 55 ὡς ὅτε βωμὸς σημαίνει καὶ ἡ στήλη περὶ τῆς τῶν τυράννων

[1] According to Paul's view we are likewise probably to take ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως together in the quotation from the O. T. in Rom. i. 17 and Gal. iii. 11. In the former passage he wishes to establish by the words of the prophet the proposition δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐκ πίστεως etc., and not ἡ ζωὴ ἐκ δικαιοσύνης. Cf. Rom. x. 6 ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη. But in Heb. x. 38 ἐκ πίστεως must undoubtedly be joined to ζήσεται; see *Bleek.*

[2] Accordingly, in Rom. v. 2 there would be no objection in *this* respect to connecting τῇ πίστει (which however Lchm. and Tdf. have rejected) εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην. There are, however, other difficulties.

ἀδικίας (where Bekker from conjecture has inserted ἡ before περί), cf. Krü. Dion. p. 153 ; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 234.

In classifying such constructions, however, we must be cautious ;[1] 149
many that seem to come under this head we shall find, on closer 130
examination, to be different ; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. al. I. 315. 7th ed.

a) Sometimes, for instance, a slight transposition of the words may have ensued, as 1 Tim. i. 2 *Τιμοθέῳ γνησίῳ τέκνῳ ἐν πίστει*, where the words *ἐν πίστει* construed according to the sense with *γνησίῳ* would mean *genuine in faith* ; cf. Xen. A. 4, 3, 23 *κατὰ τὰς προσηκούσας ὄχθας ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμόν*, i.e. *κατὰ τὰς ἐπὶ τ. π. προσηκ. ὄχθας*. For several reasons, however, it is preferable to take *ἐν πίστει* there as an adjunct to the compound notion, — *genuine child*. On the other hand, in 1 Pet. i. 2 it may be that the qualifying clauses *κατὰ πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ . . . εἰς ὑπακοὴν καὶ ῥαντισμόν* etc. should be joined to *ἐκλεκτοῖς*.

b) Elsewhere the adjunct belongs as a closer limitation directly to the verb, as Col. i. 6 *ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας ἠκούσατε καὶ ἐπέγνωτε τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* (see Bähr and Mey.), Rom. iii. 25 *ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* (see Fr. and de Wette in l.) ; viii. 2 *ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰ. ἠλευθέρωσέ με ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου* where it is evident, partly from the antithesis *νόμος τοῦ θανάτου* (to which *νόμος τῆς ζωῆς* correctly corresponds), and partly from vs. 3, that *ἐν Χριστῷ* must be connected with *ἠλευθέρωσε*, as Koppe has done ; Phil. i. 14 *τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν κυρίῳ πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου* (cf. a similar construction in Gal. v. 10 *πέποιθα* 125
εἰς ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ and 2 Thess. iii. 4), as *ἐν κυρίῳ* has a real meaning 6th ed.
only when joined to *πεποιθότας* ; Jas. iii. 13 *δειξάτω ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας*, where the words *ἐν πραΰτητι σοφίας* are an explanatory adjunct to *ἐκ τῆς καλῆς ἀναστροφῆς*. Further, cf. Rom. v. 8 ; 1 Cor. ii. 7 ; ix. 18 ; Phil. iii. 9 ; iv. 19, 21 ; Col. i. 9 ; Eph. ii. 7 ; iii. 12 ; 1 Thess. ii. 16 ; Philem. 20 ; Heb. xiii. 20 ; Jno. xv. 11, see Lücke ; 1 Jno. iv. 17 ; Jude 21. Likewise in Acts xxii. 18 *οὐ παραδέξονταί σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ* may be translated : *they will not receive concerning me thy testimony*, i.e. in reference to me no testimony from thee ; *τὴν*

[1] *Harless* on Eph. i. 15 and *Mey.* on Rom. iii. 25 etc., have taken the same view as the above. *Fr.* also, who in his letter to *Tholuck*, S. 35, had declared it a blunder to connect *διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι*, has stated (Rom. I. 195, 365) his altered opinion, and also in Rom. vi. 4 the combination *διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον*, which in p. 32 of his letter he had pronounced grammatically faulty, he has defended as alone admissible.

μαρτυρίαν τὴν περὶ ἐμοῦ would be *thy testimony to be given*, or *given, concerning me*. In Eph. v. 26 ἐν ῥήματι does not belong to τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος, but the passage is probably to be arranged thus: ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ, καθαρίσας τῷ λ. τ. ὕδ., ἐν ῥήματι. The καθαρίζειν
150 precedes the ἁγιάζειν and denotes something negative, as the latter denotes something positive; see Rück. and Mey. In Heb. x. 10 it was not necessary to write διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος . . . τῆς ἐφάπαξ; the latter word may just as well be referred to ἡγιασμένοι; see Bleek. On Eph. ii. 15 and Col. ii. 14 see § 31, note 1, p. 220.

In Eph. vi. 5 for τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα good Codd. have τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις, which Lchm. has adopted.

3. An appellative in apposition to a proper name,

131 a. Usually has the Article, e.g. Acts xxv. 13 Ἀγρίππας ὁ βασι-
7th ed. λεύς, Luke ix. 19 Ἰωάννην τὸν βαπτιστήν, Acts xii. 1; xiii. 8; xxiii. 24; xxvi. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 32; Matt. xxvii. 2, etc. In such a case the appellative always denotes a dignity, or the like, already known, and thus renders definite the proper name which may be common to many individuals. *Agrippa the king*, is properly that Agrippa who among those called Agrippa is king, etc. Cf. § 18, 6, p. 112 sq

b. On the other hand, in Acts x. 32 Σίμων βυρσεύς *Simon a tanner* (a certain Simon who was a tanner), Luke ii. 36 Ἄννα προφῆτις *Anna a prophetess*, viii. 3 Ἰωάννα, γυνὴ Χουζᾶ, ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρῴδου, Acts xx. 4 Γάϊος Δερβαῖος *Gaius of Derbe* (not *the* already known *Derbœan*), x. 22. In all these instances a predicate in apposition is simply annexed, without any precise intention of distinguishing the person from others of the same name. Likewise in Luke iii. 1 ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος must strictly be translated: *of Tiberius as emperor*. Gersd. p. 167 is incorrect. In Acts vii. 10 ἐναντίον Φαραὼ βασιλέως Αἰγύπτου does not mean: *before Pharaoh, the* (known or then) king of Egypt; but *before Pharaoh king of Egypt*, i.e. before Pharaoh who was king of Egypt. Cf. Plutarch. parallel. 15 Βρέννος Γαλατῶν Βασιλεύς, c. 30 Ἀτεπόμαρος Γάλλων βασιλεύς, etc.

With other words in apposition, also, the use or the omission of the Article is determined by the general rule; and it is strange that any one should assert, in absolute terms, that a word in ap-
126 position never has the Article. *Your father, an unlearned man*,
6th ed. would be expressed, to be sure, even in Greek without the Article; but in the expression, *your father, the field-marshal*, the Article stands with entire propriety. *Grammatically* this applies to Jno.
151 viii. 44. In general, the use of the Article may be regarded as more common than its omission (Rost 439).

The Article *may* be omitted, in accordance with the principles explained in § 19, even when the intention is to express a characteristic predicate distinctive of the particular individual; as, Rom. i. 7 *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν*, 1 Tim. i. 1 *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν θεοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*, 1 Pet. v. 8 *ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος*. So also if the appellative predicate precedes the proper name, as *κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* 2 Cor. i. 2; Gal. i. 3; Phil. iii. 20, etc.; although in the latter case the Article is used for the most part, as 1 Cor. xi. 23 *ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς*, and 2 Tim. i. 10 *τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ*, Tit. iii. 4; 1 Thess. iii. 11; Philem. 5, etc.

4. A limiting attributive joined to an *anarthrous* noun (appellative), properly dispenses with the Article; as, Matt. vii. 11 *δόματα ἀγαθά*, Jno. ix. 1 *εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς*, [Matt. ii. 1 *μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν oriental magi*], 1 Tim. iv. 3 *ἃ ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν εἰς μετάληψιν μετὰ εὐχαριστίας*, i. 5 *ἀγάπη ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας*, Tit. i. 6 *τέκνα ἔχων πιστά, μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας ἢ ἀνυπότακτα*, Rom. xiv. 17 *δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, cf. Plat. rep. 2, 378 d. *"Ηρας δὲ δεσμοὺς ὑπὸ υἱέος καὶ Ἡφαίστου ῥίψεις* 132
ὑπὸ πατρός, μέλλοντος τῇ μητρὶ τυπτομένῃ ἀμύνειν, καὶ θεομαχίας, 7th ed.
ὅσας "Ομηρος πεποίηκεν, οὐ παραδεκτέον εἰς τὴν πόλιν, Theophr. ch. 29 *ἔστι δὲ ἡ κακολογία ἀγὼν τῆς ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐν λόγοις*, Aelian. anim. 11, 15 *ἔοικα λέξειν ἐλέφαντος ὀργὴν εἰς γάμον ἀδικουμένου*.[1] Cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 91, 110, 152; Krü. 101.

Not unfrequently, however, it happens that such attributives are joined to an anarthrous noun by means of the Article; and that not merely when the noun belongs to the class specified in § 19, 1 (1 Pet. i. 21), but also in other cases, though never without adequate ground; e.g. 1 Pet. i. 7 *τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως πολυτιμότερον χρυσίου, τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου*, which is to be resolved: *more precious than gold* (that gold) *which is perishable*, Acts xxvi. 18 *πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ by faith*, namely, *the faith in me*, 2 Tim. i. 13 *ἐν ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, Tit. iii. 5 *οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων, τῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ*, Rom. ii. 14 *ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα gentiles that have not the law*, see Fr. in l. (compare on the other hand, 1 Thess. iv. 5); ix. 30; Gal. iii. 21 (compare here Liban. oratt. p. 201 b.), Heb. vi. 7; Phil. iii. 9.

In such passages, the noun is first presented to the mind as 15[2]

[1] So *κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί* might signify *a nocturnal thief;* but in 1 Thess. v. 2 with *ὡς κλέπτης ἐν νυκτί* an *ἔρχεται* is to be supplied from the following clause: that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night (cometh). Even adverbs are joined without the article — that is to say, prefixed — to such anarthrous nouns, as *μάλα χειμών* Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 14 *a severe winter*. See *Krü.* in *Jahn's* Jahrb. 1838, I. 57.

127 6th ed. indefinite,[1] and is then rendered definite by the attributive, whose import receives, by this very construction, special prominence.

See further, Acts x. 41; xix. 11, 17; xxvi. 22; Phil. i. 11; iii 6; 1 Tim. i. 4; iii. 13; iv. 8; 2 Tim. i. 14; ii. 10; Heb. ix. 2; 2 Jno. 7; Jude 4; Jas. i. 25; iv. 14; 1 Pet. v. 1. Cf. Her. 2, 114 *ἐς γῆν τὴν σήν*, Xen. M. 2, 1, 32 *ἀνθρώποις τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς men*, that is *the good*, Hiero 3, 8 *ὑπὸ γυναικῶν τῶν ἑαυτῶν*, Mem. 1, 7, 5; 4, 5, 11; Dion. H. IV. 2219, 4 *εὐνοίᾳ τῇ πρὸς αὐτόν*, 2221, 5 *ὁπλισμὸς ὁ τοῖς τηλικούτοις πρέπων*, Aelian. anim. 3, 23 *οὐδὲ ἐπὶ κέρδει τῷ μεγίστῳ*, 7, 27; Her. 5, 18; 6, 104; Plato, rep. 8, 545 a.; legg. 8, 849 b.; Demosth. Neaer. 517 b.; Theophr. ch. 15; Schneid. Isocr. Paneg. c. 24; Arrian. Ind. 34, 1; Xen. Ephes. 2, 5; 4, 3; Heliod. 7, 2; 8, 5; Strabo 7, 302; Lucian. asin. 25, 44; scyth. 1; Philostr. Apoll. 7, 30; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 409; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 106; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 241; Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 226; Mdv. S. 14.

In Phil. ii. 9 the text. rec. has *ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πᾶν ὄνομα a name that is above every name.* Yet good Codd. [Sin. also] have the Article before *ὄνομα*: *the name* (which he now enjoys), *which* etc., the (known) dignity, which etc.

---

133 5th ed. 153

CHAPTER II.

PRONOUNS.

§ 21. THE PRONOUNS IN GENERAL.

1. In the use of the Pronouns the language of the N. T. deviates from the earlier prose of the Greeks, or even from Greek usage in general, only in these two particulars: First, it multiplies the personal and demonstrative pronouns for the sake of greater perspicuity (or emphasis) § 22 sqq. Secondly, it neglects — more frequently than do the later Greeks even — many forms which ranked rather among the luxuries of the language, or were not felt by Orientals to be necessary (such as the correlatives *ὅστις*, *ὁπόσος*, *ὁποῖος*, *πηλίκος* in indirect discourse); whereas those modes of expression by which the Greek aimed at conciseness (e.g. attraction), have become very frequent in the N. T. writers

[1] This appears most plainly in sentences like Mark xv. 41 *ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.*

§ 24. On the other hand it has been erroneously asserted that *αὐτός* in the N. T. is equivalent to the unemphatic *he*. Further, the Hebraistic distribution of *οὐδείς* into *οὐ . . . πᾶς* occurs almost exclusively in aphoristic propositions or set phrases.

2. It is a peculiarity common to the Pronouns, whether personal, demonstrative, or relative, that they not unfrequently take a different gender from that of the nouns to which they refer, regard being had to the *meaning* of the nouns, not to their grammatical sex (constructio ad sensum). This happens especially when an *animate* object is denoted by a neuter substantive or a feminine abstract; the Pronoun is then made to agree grammatically with the sex of the object in question, either masc. or fem.; as, Matt. xxviii. 19 *μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτούς*, Rev. xix. 15 (cf. Exod. xxiii. 27; Deut. iv. 27; xviii. 14, etc.) Rom. ii. 14; Acts xv. 17; xxvi. 17; Gal. iv. 19 *τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω*, 2 Jno. 1 (similarly Eurip. Suppl. 12 *ἑπτὰ γενναίων τέκνων, οὕς*, Aristoph. Plut. 292), Jno. vi. 9 *ἔστι παιδάριον ἓν ὧδε, ὃς ἔχει*, as the majority of better Codd. have for the common reading *ὅ*, Mark v. 41 (Esth. ii. 9); Col. ii. 15 *τὰς ἀρχὰς κ. τ. ἐξουσίας . . . θριαμβεύσας αὐτούς*, Col. ii. 19 *τὴν κεφαλὴν (Χριστόν), ἐξ οὗ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα*, etc. (Jno. xv. 26 does not come under this head, as *πνεῦμα* is merely in apposition). For instances from Greek authors, see Mtth. 976; Wurm, Dinarch. 81 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 368; cf. Drakenborch, Liv. 29, 12. There are variants in Rev. iii. 4; xiii. 14, etc. 128 6th ed. 154

Under this head comes also Rev. xvii. 16 *καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες καὶ τὸ θηρίον, οὗτοι μισήσουσι*, where, agreeably to the symbolical language of prophecy, *κέρατα* and *θηρίον* are to be understood as denoting persons. 134 7th ed.

3. In the same way, these Pronouns when referring to a Singular noun are put in the Plural, if that noun has a collective signification, or is an abstract used for the concrete; as, Matt. i. 21 *τὸν λαὸν . . . αὐτῶν*, xiv. 14; Phil. ii. 15 *γενεά, ἐν οἷς*, 3 Jno. 9 *ἡ ἐκκλησία . . . αὐτῶν*, Eph. v. 12 *σκότος (ἐσκοτισμένοι) ὑπ' αὐτῶν*, Mark vi. 46 . . . . *τὸν ὄχλον, καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς*, Jno. xv. 6, see Lücke in loc.; Luke vi. 17, cf. § 22, 3 (but Acts xxii. 5 does not belong here); cf. Soph. Trach. 545; Thuc. 6, 91; 1, 136; Plat. Tim. 24 b. and Phaedr. 260 a.; Xen. Cyr. 6, 3, 4; Diod. S. 18, 6. This is very frequent in the Sept., Isa. lxv. 1; Exod. xxxii. 11, 33; Deut. xxi. 8; 1 Sam. xiv. 34; cf. Judith ii. 3; iv. 8; Ecclus. xvi. 8; Wisd. v. 3, 7.[1] In Phil. iii. 20 *ἐν οὐρανοῖς, ἐξ οὗ*, it was supposed

[1] In this way some expositors (e.g. *Reiche*) explain also Rom. vi. 21 *τίνα καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε ἐφ' οἷς* (that is, *καρποῖς*) *νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε*. See, however, § 23, 2, p. 158.

that the opposite construction occurs, that is, a Sing. pronoun referring to a Plural noun (Bhdy. 295); but ἐξ οὗ has become in usage nothing more than an adverb, exactly equivalent in sense to *unde*. On the other hand, in 2 Jno. 7 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ πλάνος, etc., appears a transition from the Plural μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες, etc. to the collective Singular.

Different from this is Acts xv. 36 κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν ἐν αἷς, where πᾶσα πόλις of itself (exclusively of the inhabitants), implies a plurality (πᾶσαι πόλεις) cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 92, and 2 Pet. iii. 1 ταύτην ἤδη δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς, etc., where δύο is implied in δευτέραν. I do not know of an exact parallel, but the opposite construction πάντες ὅστις, which occurs not unfrequently, may be compared with it (Rost 468).

129 Note 1. According to some expositors (e.g. Kühnöl) the pronoun now
6th ed. and then refers to a noun not expressed till afterwards; as, Matt. xvii. 18
155 ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ, namely τῷ δαιμονίῳ, Acts xii. 21 ἐδημηγόρει πρὸς αὐτούς, cf. vs. 22 ὁ δῆμος (Fr. Conject. I. p. 18 sq.), see Gesen. Lg. S. 740; Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 210. But neither of these two passages proves anything in respect to N. T. usage. In the former, αὐτῷ refers to the demoniac himself, since in the Gospels, as is well known, the person possessed and the demon possessing him are often put for each other — (against which it is of no weight that Mark ix. 25 has ἐπετίμησε τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ); in the latter passage, αὐτούς refers to the Tyrians and Sidonians (deputies), mentioned in verse 20, as even Kühnöl has acknowledged; cf. Georgi, Vind. p. 208 sq. The verb δημηγορεῖν does not interfere with this, as the king's statement was made in a full assembly of the people.

Note 2. The Neut. of the interrogative pronoun τίς, and of the demonstrative οὗτος (αὐτός), are often employed adverbially, to denote *wherefore*
135 (*why*) *therefore*. The former is so used also in Latin and German: *quid*
7th ed. *cunctaris? was zögerst du?* and originally these pronouns were considered as real Accusatives (Hm. Vig. 882; Bhdy. 130). With regard to the strengthened demonstrative αὐτὸ τοῦτο compare 2 Pet. i. 5 καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο σπουδὴν πᾶσαν παρεισενέγκαντες (Xen. Anab. 1, 9, 21; Plat. Protag. 310 e. αὐτὰ ταῦτα νῦν ἥκω παρά σε), Mtth. 1041; Ast. Plat. legg. pp. 163, 169, 214. Gal. ii. 10 does not belong here, see § 22, 4. As to τί see passages according to their various relations in Wahl, clav. 483. The Greeks use also ὅ and ἅ for δι' ὅ and δι' ἅ (Mtth. 1062); but Mey. is wrong in transferring to Acts xxvi. 16 the more poetic use of ἅ (see § 39, note 1), whereas he himself on Gal. ii. 10 rejects on this very ground the proposal of Schott to take ὅ for δι' ὅ! Likewise the distributive τοῦτο μὲν ... τοῦτο δέ *partly ... partly* Heb. x. 33 is used adverbially (Her. 1, 30; 3, 132; Lucian. Nigr. 16); cf. Wetsten. II. 423; Mtth. 740. (On 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, where two constructions are blended, see § 23, 5.)

[Note 3. Τί is used not as an interrogative, but as an exclamatory des-

ignation of degree, in Matt. vii. 14 *τί στενή how strait is the gate!* Luke xii. 49 *τί θέλω how would I* (how much I wish!). This use is unknown to the classics, but is found in the Sept., e.g. 2 Sam. vi. 20, where the Hebrew מָה is rendered in this way.]

§ 22. PERSONAL AND POSSESSIVE PRONOUNS.

1. The personal pronouns, in accordance with Hebrew circumstantiality, are far more frequently employed in the Greek of the N. T. than in the classics.[1] Particularly,

Αὐτοῦ, σοῦ, etc., with substantives (especially in connection 156
with the Middle Voice § 38, 2), as Jno. ii. 12; Luke vi. 20; vii. 50; xi. 34; xxiv. 50; Matt. vi. 17; xv. 2; Mark xii. 30; 1 Pet. iii. 11; Rom. ix. 17; xvi. 7; Acts xxv. 21, etc. (cf. 1 Macc. i. 6; Josh. xxiii. 2; xxiv. 1; Neh. ix. 34);

The subject Acc. with the Inf., as Luke x. 35 *ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ἐπανέρ-* 130
χεσθαί με ἀποδώσω, Jno. ii. 24; Heb. vii. 24; Acts i. 3; 6th ed.

Oblique cases with a participle and at the same time with the principal verb, as Mark x. 16 *ἐναγκαλισάμενος αὐτὰ κατευλόγει τιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' αὐτά*, ix. 28; Acts vii. 21; Luke xvi. 2; 2 Pet. iii. 16; (cf. below, no. 4.) So especially in the Apocalypse. On the other hand, in Matt. xxii. 37 and Rev. ix. 21 the repetition of the pronoun is probably to be charged to the account of the rhythm.

In connection with this tendency to multiply pronouns, only a few passages occur where the pronoun is wanting when it might have been expected, e.g. Acts xiii. 3 *καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς* 136
ἀπέλυσαν (*αὐτούς*), Mark vi. 5; Eph. v. 11; Phil. i. 6; 2 Thess. 7th ed.
iii. 12; Heb. iv. 15; xiii. 17; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Jno. x. 29; Luke xiv. 4 (cf. Demosth. Conon. 728b. *ἐμοὶ περιπεσόντες . . . ἐξέδυσαν*).[2] On the other hand, in Matt. xxi. 7 the better reading is *ἐπεκάθισεν*, and in 1 Cor. x. 9 *πειράζειν* may be taken absolutely; in 2 Tim. ii. 11 *σὺν αὐτῷ* would be heavy in an aphoristic saying. In 1 Pet. ii. 11 *ὑμᾶς*, which appears in the MSS. now after *παρακαλῶ* now after *ἀπέχεσθαι*, is certainly not genuine. In acclamations, such as Matt. xxvii. 22 *σταυρωθήτω*, the omission of the pronoun is very natural (in German the Inf. would likewise be used without a

[1] In the language of Homer, however, the possessive pronoun *ὅς* is quite parallel. Later (and sometimes earlier) prose authors use also *αὐτός* thus *abundanter*. *Schaef.* ind. Aesop. p. 124; *Schoem.* ad Isaeum, p. 382.

[2] In Latin compare Sallust, Jug. 54, 1 universos in concione laudat atque agit gratias (iis), Cic. Orat. 1, 15 si modo erunt ad eum delata et tradita (ei), Liv. 1, 11 and 20. Cf. *Kritz* on the first passage.

pronoun: *kreuzigen!*); yet the parallel passage Mark xv. 13 has *σταύρωσον αὐτόν*. (In Greek authors the omission of the Pronoun is carried much further; see Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 294; Bremi, Lys. p. 50; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 78, 157, 232; V. 556, 567.)

In Eph. iii. 18 *τί τὸ πλάτος*, etc., the addition of *αὐτῆς* (*ἀγάπης*) would hardly help the passage; see Mey. Many (e.g. Kühnöl) quite erroneously hold the pronoun to be redundant in Matt. xxi. 41 *κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς*. Without *αὐτούς* the statement would be altogether general. Αὐτούς is required to connect it with the case in hand, — with the *γεωργοῖς* spoken of.

2. Instead of the personal pronouns the nouns themselves are sometimes employed: — either from the writer's inadvertence, or
157 with a view to relieve the reader's uncertainty when more than one reference of the pronoun is possible, or because the noun stands at a great distance; as, Jno. iii. 23 f.; x. 41; Luke iii. 19; Eph. iv. 12; cf. 1 Kings ix. 1; xii. 1 (Xen. Eph. 2, 13; Thuc. 6, 105; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 29); Ellendt, Arrian. I. 55.

But in Jno. iv. 1 *Ἰησοῦς* is repeated because the apostle wishes to quote the express words which the Pharisees had heard; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 23. Further, those passages in Christ's discourses must not be referred to this head, in which, instead of the pronoun, the name of a person or of an office is repeated for the sake of emphasis; as, Mark ix. 41 *ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστε*, Luke xii. 8 *πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ... καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ*, Jno. vi. 40; 1 Cor. i. 8, 21; 1 Jno. v. 6; Col. ii. 11, and often. Cf. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 5 e.; Aeschyl. Prom. vinct. 312; Cic. fam. 2, 4. In all these instances the pronoun would be out of place,
131 and would mar the rhetorical effect. Least of all does the familiar
6th ed. appellation *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, under which Jesus speaks of himself in the Synoptic Gospels as of a third person, stand for *ἐγώ*.

At other times the repetition of the noun is intended to denote an emphatic antithesis; as, Jno. ix. 5 *ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὦ, φῶς εἰμι*
137 *τοῦ κόσμου*, xii. 47 *οὐκ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον ἀλλ' ἵνα*
7th ed. *σώσω τὸν κόσμον* (Xen. An. 3, 2, 23 *οἳ βασιλέως ἄκοντος ἐν τῇ βασιλέως χώρᾳ ... οἰκοῦσι*), Arrian. Al. 2, 18, 2; Krü. 114 (Liv. 1, 10, 1; 6, 2, 9; 38, 56, 3). Accordingly, even in the following passages no one will regard the repetition of the noun as idle: Rom. v. 12 *δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος*, Jno. x. 29 *ὁ πατήρ μου, ὃς δέδωκέ μοι, μείζων πάντων ἐστί· καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἁρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρός μου*. Cf. besides, Acts iii. 16. See § 65.

In Acts x. 7 the better Codd. have the personal pronoun (see Kühnöl in loc.) and τῷ Κορνηλίῳ is evidently a gloss. The passages which Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 190 quotes from Greek authors are not all to the point, nor is the reading in all of them fully established.

The assertion that it is especially characteristic of Mark to repeat the noun instead of the pronoun αὐτός or ἐκεῖνος (Schulze in Keil's Analect. II. II. 112) is not entirely correct. In Mark ii. 18 the nouns were indispensable, — (the writer could not put into the mouth of the inquirers an ἐκεῖνοι referring to *his*, the historian's, words) ; in vi. 41, and also in xiv. 67, the pronouns would have been quite unsuitable ; in ii. 27 the nouns were employed for the sake of antithesis ; in i. 34 ; iii. 24 ; v. 9 ; x. 46 we find circumstantiality (as often in Cæsar), and not strictly the use of nouns for pronouns. Compare Ellendt, as above.

3. The pronoun αὐτός[1] is frequently so employed, through the negligence of the writer, that in the propositions immediately preceding there is no substantive expressed to which it can be directly 158
referred.

Such cases may be reduced to *four* classes :

1) Αὐτός in the Plur. very frequently refers to a collective noun, particularly the name of a place or country (cf. § 21, 3), which includes the idea of the inhabitants ; as, Matt. iv. 23 ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν, that is Γαλιλαίων (from ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν), ix. 35 (Luke iv. 15) ; Matt. xi. 1 ; 1 Thess. i. 9 cf. vs. 8 ; Acts viii. 5 ; xx. 2 ; 2 Cor. ii. 12, 13 ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα . . . ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς, v. 19 θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα, Jno. xvii. 2. This usage is common enough in Greek authors, cf. Thuc. 1, 27, 136 ; Lucian. Tim. 9 ; dial. mort. 12, 4 ; Dion. H. IV. 2117 ; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 59.[2]

Akin to this is, 2) the use of αὐτός in reference to an abstract 132
noun to be deduced from a preceding concrete, or *vice versâ* : as, 6th ed.
Jno. viii. 44 ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ (ψεύδους), see Lücke 138
in loc.,[3] Rom. ii. 26 ἐὰν ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὰ δικαιώματα τοῦ νόμου φυλάσσῃ, οὐχὶ ἡ ἀκροβυστία αὐτοῦ (of such an ἀκρόβυστος) εἰς περιτομὴν λογισθήσεται ; cf. Theodoret. I. 914 τοῦτο τῆς ἀποστο- 7th ed.

[1] Compare, in general, *Hm.* diss. de pronom. αὐτός in the Acta Seminar. philol. Lips. Vol. I. 42 sqq. and his Opusc. I. 308 sqq.

[2] Simpler is the reference of αὐτός in the Plur. to an abstract signifying in itself nothing more than a community of individuals, as ἐκκλησία. On this see § 21, 3. On Col. iv. 15 according to the reading αὐτῶν, see *Mey.* in loc.

[3] The other explanation : *father of the liar*, appears neither grammatically simpler nor preferable in meaning. Indeed, *father of falsehood* is a more comprehensive idea, and John has a predilection for abstract expressions.

λικῆς χάριτος ἴδιον· αὐτοῖς γὰρ (ἀποστόλοις) etc.[1] In Luke xxiii. 51 αὐτῶν refers to the Sanhedrim, implied in the predicate βουλευτής verse 50. Cf. Jonah i. 3 εὗρε πλοῖον βαδίζον εἰς Θαρσίς . . . καὶ ἀνέβη εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦ πλεῦσαι μετ' αὐτῶν, etc., see above, No. 2. Sallust. Cat. 17, 7 simul confisum, si coniuratio valuisset, facile apud illos (that is, coniuratos) principem se fore. Similar to this passage from Luke would be Matt. viii. 4 (Mark i. 44; Luke v. 14) εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, if the pronoun referred to the foregoing ἱερεῖ, and thus αὐτοῖς agreed with the Plur. ἱερεῦσι understood; but, if the cured man has already received from the priests permission to present the purification-offering prescribed by the law, the priests would need no further μαρτύριον of his being cleansed. See 4) below.

159 3) Αὐτός sometimes refers to something implied in a preceding word, or even in the verb of the sentence; as, 1 Pet. iii. 14 τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε, that is τῶν κακούντων ὑμᾶς, or those from whom you must suffer (πάσχειν), see Hm. Vig. 714;[2] Eph. v. 12 τὰ κρυφῇ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτῶν, that is τῶν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σκότους ποιούντων verse 11; Acts x. 10. Cf. Aristoph. Plut. 566; Thuc. 1, 22, 1 and Poppo, in loc.; Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 539. On Acts xii. 21 see § 21, note 1, p. 142.

4) Αὐτός sometimes has no antecedent grammatically implied in what precedes, but must be referred to some subject assumed to be known; as, Luke i. 17 αὐτὸς προελεύσεται αὐτοῦ (i.e. before the Messiah), see Kühnöl in loc.—(αὐτός of an individual recognized in a certain circle as head or leader, as in αὐτὸς ἔφα; so of Christ in 1 Jno. ii. 12; 2 Jno. 6; 2 Pet. iii. 4). In Luke v. 17 εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς, the pronoun expresses the general notion *the sick, those who required healing* (among the persons present in the synagogue); the pronoun cannot be referred to verse 15 (though this is done even by Bengel). On the other hand, αὐτῶν in Acts iv. 5 refers to the *Jews*, among whom the events occurred (in verse 1, moreover, their priests et al. are mentioned; and several times λαός in the same verse and sequel has pointed to
139 the Jews). In Matt. xii. 9 the pronoun refers to those (Galileans)
7th ed. among whom Jesus was at the time; in Heb. iv. 8; viii. 8;

[1] With the relative compare Testam. patr. p. 608 ἀπεκάλυψα τῇ Χαναναίτιδι Βησουέ, οἷς (Χαναναίοις) εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς μὴ ἀποκαλύψαι. Compare also the passage of an ancient poet in Cic. orat. 2, 46, 193: neque *paternum* adspectum es veritus, *quem* (patrem) aetate exacta indigem Liberum lacerasti, and Gell. 2, 30, 6.

[2] Otherwise in Epiphan. II. 368 a. εὖξαί μοι, πάτερ, ὅπως ὑγιαίνω· . . . πίστευε, τέκνον, τῷ ἐσταυρωμένῳ, καὶ ἕξεις ταύτην (ὑγείαν).

xi. 28 it refers to the Israelites, suggested to the reader by the 133
antecedent particulars. The above-mentioned *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς* 6th ed.
Matt. viii. 4 comes under this head; those meant by *αὐτοῖς* are the Jews (the public, the community among whom the precepts of Moses, *ὃ προσέταξε Μωϋσῆς*, are recognized). In Jno. xx. 15 *αὐτόν* presupposes that the inquirer knew who was meant, inasmuch as it was thought he had taken him away; or Mary in answering, engrossed with the thought of the Lord, attributes to the inquirer her own impressions. Cf. besides, Poppo, Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 31; 5, 4, 42; Thuc. III. I. 184; Lehmann, Lucian. II. 325; IV. 429; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 286, and, generally, van Hengel, annotat. p. 195 sqq.

In Luke xviii. 34 *αὐτοί* refers to *τοὺς δώδεκα* and *αὐτούς* in verse 31 (what intervenes being a statement of our Lord's). So also in Heb. iv. 13 160
αὐτοῦ relates to *τοῦ θεοῦ* in 12; and *αὐτῆς* in Luke xxi. 21 to *Ἱερουσαλήμ* in 20. Lastly, in 2 Cor. vi. 17 *ἐκ μέσου αὐτῶν*, in a somewhat transformed quotation from the Old Test., refers to *ἄπιστοι* in verse 14; and in Rom. x. 18 *αὐτῶν* suggests to every reader the preachers, who were also mentioned concretely in 15. On Acts xxvii. 14, where some have referred *αὐτῆς* to the *ship*, see Kühnöl in loc. In Luke ii. 22 *αὐτῶν* points to mother and child (Mary and Jesus). Expositors are not agreed whether in Heb. xii. 17 *αὐτήν* refers to *μετάνοιαν* or to *εὐλογίαν*; from the correlation between *εὑρίσκειν* and *ἐκζητεῖν*, however, the former reference is the more probable. In Matt. iii. 16 *αὐτῷ* and *ἐπ' αὐτόν* relate unquestionably to Jesus.

A slight inadvertence of another sort appears in Matt. xii. 15; xix. 2 *ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτοὺς πάντας*. Here the pronoun grammatically refers to *ὄχλοι*, but logically this reference can be only a loose one: *he healed them*, that is the sick in the crowds, *collectively* (xiv. 14 *ἐθεράπευσε τοὺς ἀῤῥώστους αὐτῶν*). Compare also Luke v. 17.

According to some expositors the *demonstrative* also is, in a similar way, construed ad sensum in 2 Cor. v. 2. After *ἐν τούτῳ* they supply *σώματι*, as being implied in *ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους*. But it is much simpler to supply *σκήνει*, from verse 4. That the Greeks, however, did employ the demonstrative as well as *αὐτός* with a want of precision in the reference is well known, cf. Mätzner, Antiph. p. 200. In fact, Acts x. 10 would be an instance of this, if the reading *ἐκείνων* for *αὐτῶν* were correct.

4. A repetition of this pronoun (*αὐτός*), and also of the other personal pronouns, occurs,

a. When subjoined for the sake of perspicuity, in sentences where the principal noun is followed by a number of other words; as, Mark v. 2 *ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου εὐθέως ἀπήντησεν αὐτῷ*, ix. 28; Matt. iv. 16; v. 40; viii. 1; xxvi. 71; Acts vii. 21; Jas.

iv. 17; Rev. vi. 4; Col. ii. 13 *καὶ ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς παρα-*
140 *πτώμασιν καὶ τῇ ἀκροβυστίᾳ τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς*,
7th ed. etc. Phil. i. 7. In the majority of these passages a participial construction, equivalent to an independent clause, precedes; in this same case even the Greek authors often add the pronoun, Paus. 8, 38, 5; Herod. 3, 10, 6. Further, cf. Plat. Apol. 40 d.; symp. c.
134 21; Xen. C. 1, 3, 15, and Oec. 10, 4; Paus. 2, 3, 8; Arrian. Epict.
6th ed. 3, 1; also Cic. Catil. 2, 12, 27; Liv. 1, 2; Sall. Catil. 40, 1; Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 54; Schwarz, Comment. p. 217. The pronoun is used for the sake of emphasis in Jno. xviii. 11 *τὸ ποτήριον ὃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό;* Matt. vi. 4; 1 Pet. v. 10 (Acts ii. 23); Rev. xxi. 6. (After a case absolute, the pronoun, in the case
161 required by the verb, is introduced almost indispensably; as, Rev. iii. 12 *ὁ νικῶν, ποιήσω αὐτόν*, Jno. xv. 2; Matt. xii. 36; Acts vii. 40, cf. Plat. Theaet. 173 d.; Ael. anim. 5, 34; 1, 48 a.)

b. This redundancy occurs more frequently in relative clauses, as Mark vii. 25 *γυνή, ἧς εἶχε τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*, i. 7; Rev. vii. 2 *οἷς ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ἀδικῆσαι τὴν γῆν*, etc., iii. 8; vii. 9; xiii. 8; xx. 8; similar to which is Mark xiii. 19 *θλῖψις, οἵα οὐ γέγονε τοιαύτη ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως*. So also with a relative adverb, as Rev. xii. 6, 14 *ὅπου ἔχει ἐκεῖ τόπον* etc.

In the Sept. (in accordance with the Hebrew idiom, see Gesen. Lg. 743), such usage is far more frequent, as Exod. iv. 17; Lev. xi. 32, 34; xiii. 52; xv. 4, 9, 17, 20, 24, 26; xvi. 9, 32; xviii. 5; Num. xvii. 5; Deut. xi. 25; Josh. iii. 4; xxii. 19; Judg. xviii. 5, 6; Ruth i. 7; iii. 2, 4; 1 Kings xi. 34; xiii. 10, 25, 31; 2 Kings xix. 4; Baruch ii. 4; iii. 8; Neh. viii. 12; ix. 19; Isa. i. 21; Joel iii. 7; Ps. xxxix. 5; Judith v. 19; vii. 10; x. 2; xvi. 3; 3 Esr. iii. 5; iv. 54; vi. 32, etc.; see Thiersch, de Pentat. alex. p. 126 sq.

Even in Greek prose, however, *αὐτός* (Göttling, Callim. p. 19 sq.; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 550), or a demonstrative, is sometimes superadded in a relative clause: Xen. C. 1, 4, 19; D. S. 1, 97; 17, 35; Paus. 2, 4, 7; Soph. Philoct. 316 (cf. in Latin Cic. fam. 4, 3; Acad. 2, 25; Philipp. 2, 8). Yet the demonstrative could very seldom be found so closely connected with the relative as in most of the preceding passages (which are almost all furnished by a style that has a Hebraistic tinge).[1] See, further, Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 58; Vc. Fritzsche, Quaest. Lucian. p. 109 sq.

In Acts iii. 13 the writer drops the relative structure in the second clause

[1] In Aristoph. Av. 1238 the Cod. Rav. has *οἷς θυτέον αὐτοῖς* for the rec. *οἷς θυτ. αὐτούς*. On another accumulation of the pronoun see below, § 23, 3.

(see just below). In Rom. vii. 21 the first *ἐμοί* does not appear to me to belong to the same proposition as the second, see § 61, 5. Different also are those passages in which with the pers. pron. still another word is joined by which the relative is epexegetically defined, as Gal. iii. 1 *οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χρ. προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν* (*in animis vestris*) *ἐσταυρωμένος* (Lev. xv. 16; xxi. 20; xxii. 4; Ruth ii. 2); Rev. xvii. 9 *ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν*, xiii. 12; cf. Gen. xxiv. 3, 37; Judg. vi. 10; Exod. xxxvi. 1; Lev. xvi. 32; 141
Judith ix. 2. Likewise in Gal. ii. 10 *ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι* 7th ed.
the emphasis in the subjoined *αὐτό*, strengthened by *τοῦτο*, is evident (Bornem. Luc. p. LIV). We must not bring under this head 1 Pet. ii. 24 *ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήνεγκεν* etc., where *αὐτός* obviously stands by itself, and gives additional force to the antithesis with *ἁμαρτ. ἡμῶν*. In Matt. iii. 12 *οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ*, the relative serves 162
instead of *τούτου* to connect what follows with the preceding clause, and both pronouns are to be taken separately, as if it read, *he has* HIS *winnowing shovel in* HIS *hand*. Eph. ii. 10 *οἷς προητοίμασεν* is to be considered 135
as an attraction for *ἃ προητ.* Lastly, in Eph. ii. 21 *ἐν κυρίῳ* belongs 6th ed.
probably with *εἰς ναὸν ἅγιον*.

Sometimes *αὐτός* is repeated in quick succession, though referring to different subjects: Mark viii. 22 *φέρουσιν αὐτῷ* (*Χριστῷ*) *τυφλὸν καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν* (*Χριστόν*), *ἵνα αὐτοῦ* (*τυφλοῦ*) *ἅψηται*, Mark ix. 27, 28. So *οὗτος* in Jno. xi. 37. See below, § 67.

In a clause following a relative clause, and where *ὅς* or its continued influence might be expected, Greek authors frequently — indeed, almost uniformly (Bhdy. 304) — employ *καὶ αὐτός* (*οὗτος*), the writer modifying the construction, (Hm. Vig. 707; Ast. Plat. legg. p. 449; Boisson. Nic. p. 32; Bornem. Xenoph. conv. p. 196; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 68; rep. I. 197; Foertsch, observ. in Lysiam, p. 67; Weber, Dem. 355; Teipel, Scriptores Graec., Germ., Lat. a relativa verbor. construct. saepe neque injuria semper discessisse. Coesfeld, 1841, 4to.; cf. Grotefend, lat. Gramm. § 143, 5; Kritz, Sallust. II. 540). From the N. T. may be quoted under this head, 2 Pet. ii. 3 *οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει*, Acts iii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 6, with less appropriateness Rev. xvii. 2 *μεθ' ἧς ἐπόρνευσαν ... καὶ ἐμεθύσθησαν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς*, where it was necessary to avoid the construction with the relative on account of the nouns to be connected with the pronoun. In Hebrew, as is well known, owing to its great simplicity, the continuing of a sentence without the relative is very common; yet an idiom foreign to the genius of the language should not be introduced into the text by supplying אֲשֶׁר with the following clause. (In passages such as Jno. i. 6; Acts x. 36; Luke ii. 36; xix. 2, to require the relative instead of *αὐτός* or *οὗτος*, is to misapprehend the simplicity of N. T. diction; particularly as even Greek authors not unfrequently employ the same idiom; see Aelian 12, 18; Strabo 8, 371; Philostr. Soph. 1, 25; cf. Kypke I. 347. On the other

hand, in 1 Cor. vii. 13 for ἥτις ἔχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον καὶ αὐτὸς συνευδοκεῖ etc. the expression ὃς συνευδ. etc. might have been used.)

In the N. T. ὁ αὐτός, *the same*, takes after it a Dat. of the person when it denotes *the same* (*identical*) *with*, as 1 Cor. xi. 5; cf. Her. 4, 119; Xen. M. 1, 1, 13; 2, 1, 5; Cyr. 3, 3, 35; 7, 1, 2; Isocr. Paneg. c. 23; Plat. Menex. 244 b.; Dio. Ch. 332, 97.

Note. Αὐτός in the Nom., as is well known, never stands in classic Greek for the unemphatic *he* (Krü. 109, 114). From the N. T. also[1] no decisive
142 passages can be produced to prove this usage [which Bttm. Gramm. des
7th ed. neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 93 f. wrongly concedes] (cf. Fr. Mt. p. 47); even in Luke, who employs αὐτός the most frequently (cf., in particular, Luke
163 v. 16, 17; xix. 2), it never occurs without a certain emphasis. It denotes,

a. *Self*, in complex antitheses, and for all the three persons, as Mark
136 ii. 25 ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, Acts xviii. 19 ἐκείνους κατέλιπεν, αὐτὸς
6th ed. δὲ εἰσελθών, etc., Luke v. 37; x. 1; xviii. 39; 1 Cor. iii. 15; Mark i. 8; Jno. iv. 2; vi. 6; ix. 21; Luke vi. 42 πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν ... αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σοῦ δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων, Heb. xi. 11 πίστει καὶ αὐτὴ Σάῤῥα δύναμιν εἰς καταβολὴν σπέρματος ἔλαβεν *even Sara herself* (who had been incredulous), Jno. xvi. 27 αὐτὸς ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς *he himself*, of himself (without entreaty on my part, verse 26), Rom. viii. 23. Αὐτός was thus used by the disciples in speaking of Christ (compare the well known αὐτὸς ἔφα): Mark iv. 38; Luke v. 16; ix. 51; xxiv. (15) 36. Cf. Fischer, ind. Theophan. under αὐτός. See, in general, the Lexicons.

b. Emphatic *he*, *even he:* Matt. i. 21 καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν· αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει τὸν λαόν, xii. 50; Col. i. 17. Αὐτός is not used for the unemphatic *he* also in Luke i. 22 (*he* himself, as distinguished from the rest: ἐπέγνωσαν), ii. 28 (*he* Simeon, as distinguished from the parents of Jesus, verse 27), iv. 15; vii. 5 (*he*, of himself, from his own resources), Acts xiv. 12 (*he* Paul, as leader, verse 11), Mark vii. 36; [1 Thess. iii. 11; iv. 16; v. 23; 2 Thess. ii. 16; iii. 16.] (On the antithesis in Rom. viii. 23 αὐτοὶ ... ἐν ἑαυτοῖς see Fr. in loc.)

5. The reflexive pronoun ἑαυτοῦ, etc., which originally (as compounded of ἕ and αὐτός) belongs to the third person, and in the N. T. is regularly so employed (frequently in antithesis and with emphasis, 1 Cor. x. 29; xiv. 4; Eph. v. 28, etc.), is also, when no ambiguity is to be apprehended, employed in reference to the first and second persons. It is used

a. In the Plural, — as well for the first person, Rom. viii. 23 (ἡμεῖς) αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν, 1 Cor. xi. 31; 2 Cor. i. 9; x. 12; Acts xxiii. 14, etc., as for the second, Jno. xii. 8 τοὺς πτωχοὺς πάντοτε

[1] According to *Thiersch*, de Pent. vers. Alex. p. 98, the LXX often use the masc. αὐτός for *he*; but not αὐτή or αὐτό, instead of which the demonstrative is regularly employed. In reference to the Apocrypha, *Wahl*, clavis p. 80, utterly denies such a use.

ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, Phil. ii. 12 τὴν ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίαν κατεργάζεσθε, Matt. iii. 9; xxiii. 31; Acts xiii. 46; Heb. iii. 13; x. 25, etc.

b. In the Singular, though far less frequently (Bhdy. 272), in reference to the second person, as Jno. xviii. 34 ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ σὺ τοῦτο λέγεις, where σεαυτοῦ in Codd. B [Sin.] and others is undoubtedly a correction; in Rom. xiii. 9; Matt. xxii. 39 Sept. and Gal. v. 14 σεαυτόν is preponderant.

This same usage is found in Greek authors (under b. in particular cf. Xen. M. 1, 4, 9; C. 1, 6, 44; Aristot. Nicom. 2, 9; 9, 9; Aelian. 1, 21; Arrian. Epict. 4, 3, 11), see Locella, Xenoph. Eph. 164; Bremi, Aeschin. oratt. I. 66; Hm. Soph. Trach. 451; Boisson. Philostr. Her. p. 326; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 932; Held, Plut. Aem. Paul. p. 130. Yet compare the assertion of an ancient grammarian, Apollonius, in Wolf and Bttm. Mus. antiq. stud. I. 360 and Eustath. ad Odyss. é. p. 240. (On ἑαυτῶν etc. for ἀλλήλων see the Lexicons; cf. Döderlein, Synon. III. 270.) 143 7th ed. 164

In the classic (Attic) writers αὑτοῦ etc. is of frequent occurrence as a reflexive (Arndt, de pronom. reflex. ap. Graec. Neobrandenb. 1836, 4to.); in many passages, however, the Codd. vary between αὑτοῦ and αὐτοῦ.[1] It is the more difficult to determine on *internal* grounds which of these in each particular case is the true reading, because in Greek a reflexive may occur at a considerable distance from the principal subject,[2] and because it often depended entirely on the writer whether he would use a reflexive or not; see Bttm. 10 exc. ad Demosth. Mid. p. 140 sqq.;[3] F. Hermann, comm. crit. ad Plutarch. superst. p. 37 sq.; Benseler, Isocr. Areop. p. 220. Likewise in the N. T., in which since Griesbach αὑτοῦ has often been adopted, cautious editors have frequently been at a loss in deciding whether αὑτοῦ or αὐτοῦ should be preferred. Sometimes either would be appropriate. In Matt. iii. 16, for instance, εἶδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν might be used from the narrator's point of view; on the other hand, ἐφ' αὑτόν would refer directly to the subject of the verb εἶδε, that is, Jesus (Krü. 110). In the N. T. it is, in general, unlikely that a reflexive should be used in reference to a remote subject, that is, one which is not in the 137 6th ed.

[1] In the later writers, as Aesop, the Scholiasts, etc. αὑτοῦ seems to predominate; see *Schaef.* ind. ad Aesop. p. 124. Cf. *Thilo*, Apocr. I. 163.

[2] Cf., however, *Held*, Plut. Timol. p. 373.

[3] *Bremi*, in the Jahrb. der Philol. IX. S. 171, says: "On the use of αὑτοῦ and αὐτοῦ it is easy to lay down rules, but in certain cases the decision will always remain doubtful; and it is far more difficult in Greek than in Latin to hit the mark," etc. "When the reference to the subject predominates in the mind, the reflexive is used; but when the subject is viewed as a more remote object, the pronoun of the 3d person. In Greek one must yield rather to his individual impression, if you please, his mood at the moment." Further, see some good remarks on reciprocal pronouns in general by *Hoffmann*, in the Jahrb. d. Philol. VII. S. 38 ff.

same proposition as the pronoun; this is owing to the simplicity of its narrative style, which, in like manner, disdains to adhere closely to the relative construction, see above p. 149. Accordingly, in Matt. in the passage referred to and in Eph. i. 17 *αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ*, should be adopted without hesitation, but *αὑτοῦ* in Acts xii. 11; Heb. v. 7; Rom. xiv. 14; see Fr. Exc. 5 ad Matt. p. 858 sqq. (where the view of Matthiae ad Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 800 and Gramm. I. 355 is examined); Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 159 sq. On the other hand, it deserves attention, as remarked by Bengel, appar. ad Matt. i. 21, that in the Codd. of the N. T. the prepositions *ἀπό, ἐπί, ὑπό, κατά, μετά, [ἀντί]* are never written *ἀφ', ἐφ'*, etc. before *αυτου*. Hence, with Bleek (Epist. to the Heb. II. 69), it might be inferred that the N. T. writers never employed the reflexive form *αὑτοῦ*, (but used, wherever necessary, *ἑαυτοῦ* instead of it). In fact, recent editors have printed the form *αὐτοῦ* almost everywhere; as the uncial Codd. of the N. T. and of the Sept. that have diacritic marks recognize *αὐτοῦ* almost
144 exclusively (Tdf. praef. N. T. p. 26 sq. [ed. vii. p. 58 sq.]). These Codd.,
7th ed. to be sure, are not of greater antiquity than the eighth century, and the
165 expression "*fere* constanter" suggests the desirableness of a more accurate collation. Now it is true that in most passages a reflexive is not absolutely required; yet it is difficult to believe that Paul in Rom. iii. 25 could have written *εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ* (in the face of *ἐν αἵματι αὐτοῦ*), or Jno. in ix. 21 *αὐτὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ*; compare also Eph. i. 9; Rom. xiv. 14; Luke xix. 15; xiii. 34; Mark viii. 35; Rev. xi. 7; xiii. 2. Hence in the N. T. also, the choice between *αὐτοῦ* and *αὑτοῦ* must be left to the *discreet* judgment of editors.

6. The personal pronouns *ἐγώ, σύ, ἡμεῖς*, etc. are indispensable in the oblique cases, but in the Nom. they are regularly employed
138 only when emphasis — and mostly in consequence of an antithesis
6th ed. — is expressed or implied in them; as, Phil. iv. 11 *ἐγὼ ἔμαθον ἐν οἷς εἰμὶ αὐτάρκης εἶναι*, Jno. ii. 10 *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος . . . σὺ τετήρηκας* etc., Rom. vii. 17; Luke xi. 19; Acts x. 15; Mark xiv. 29; Jno. xviii. 38 f.; Gal. ii. 9; Acts xi. 14 *σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου*, Jno. x. 30; Acts xv. 10; 1 Cor. vii. 12; Luke i. 18; Matt. vi. 12 *ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν* etc., Jno. iv. 10 *σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας αὐτόν* (while *I* asked of thee, verses 7, 9), Mark vi. 37 *δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν* (*ye*, since they themselves have no provisions with them vs. 36), Jno. vi. 30; xxi. 22; Mark xiii. 9, 23; 1 Cor. ii. 3 f.; Matt. xvii. 19; 2 Tim. iv. 6.

So when the person is described by a word in apposition, as Jno. iv. 9 *πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὤν* etc., Rom. xiv. 4 *σὺ τίς εἶ ὁ κρίνων ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην*, Jno. x. 33; Acts i. 24; iv. 24; Luke i. 76; Eph. iv. 1; or reference is made to some preceding description, as Jno. v. 44 (42, 43); Rom. ii. 3; or such description is assumed as

something known, as Jno. i. 30; Luke ix. 9 (*I*,—one who as king is certain of what has taken place); Eph. v. 32 (I as apostle); Jno. ix. 24; Gal. vi. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 23. Σύ is used in addresses particularly when one out of many is meant, as Jno. i. 43; Jas. ii. 3; or when the person addressed is made prominent by an attributive, as 2 Tim. ii. 1; Matt. xi. 23.

These pronouns nowhere occur wholly without emphasis and where they might have been dispensed with (Bornem. Xen. Conv. 187). For when in Eph. v. 32, for instance, we find ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω εἰς Χριστόν, but in 1 Cor. i. 12; Rom. xv. 8 λέγω δέ,—in the first passage an emphasis is intended, in the other two, none. Moreover, the Codd. vary much with regard to the use or omission, as well as the position, of these pronouns; and each case must be decided, not according to any fancied peculiarity of style in the separate writers (Gersd. I. 472 f.), but according to the nature of the sentence.

The personal pronoun is both used and omitted in close succession in 166
Luke x. 23, 24 οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε ... πολλοὶ προφῆται ... ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν, ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε. Only the latter case, however, contains a real antithesis (ὑμεῖς opposed to προφῆται, βασιλ., etc.); in the first, the ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε are properly none other than those of which the βλέπετε is predicated. Compare 2 Cor. xi. 29 τίς ἀσθενεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; 145
τίς σκανδαλίζεται καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι; where it must be noticed that in 7th ed.
the latter member πυροῦμαι (which the apostle applies to *himself*) is a stronger word than σκανδαλίζεσθαι. In 1 Cor. xiii. 12 τότε ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην, some authorities add ἐγώ to the latter verb; but incongruously, since the antithesis is expressed by the *vox verbi*.

It may be remarked, in passing, that in some books of the Old Test. the emphatic אָנֹכִי with a verb has been translated by the Sept. ἐγώ εἰμι, with which the first person of the verb is then connected; as, Judg. xi. 27 וְאָנֹכִי לֹא חָטָאתִי καὶ νῦν ἐγώ εἰμι οὐχ ἥμαρτον; cf. v. 3; vi. 18; 1 Kings ii. 2.

On αὐτὸς ἐγώ (in Acts x. 26 κἀγὼ αὐτός) see Fr. Rom. II. 75.

7. The possessive pronouns are sometimes to be understood *objectively*; as, Luke xxii. 19 ἡ ἐμὴ ἀνάμνησις *memoria mei* (1 Cor. xi. 24), Rom. xi. 31 τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει, xv. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 31; xvi. 17 139
(not in Jno. xv. 10). So also in Greek authors (especially the 6th ed.
poets); as, Xen. Cyr. 3, 1, 28 εὐνοίᾳ καὶ φιλίᾳ τῇ ἐμῇ, Thuc. 1, 77 τὸ ἡμέτερον δέος, 6, 89; Plato, Gorg. 486 a.; Antiphon. 6, 41, etc. On the Latin cf. Kritz, Sallust. Cat. p. 243.

Instead of a possessive pronoun ἴδιος is occasionally employed in the N. T.—an impropriety similar to the use of *proprius* instead of *suus* or *ejus* in later Latin (and of οἰκεῖος by the Byzantine

writers, see e.g. Index to Agath., Petr. Patric., Priscus, Dexipp., Glycas, and Theophanes in the Bonn edit.), — as Matt. xxii. 5 *ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν*, without any emphasis (that is, without any antithesis to *κοινός* or *ἀλλότριος*), its parallel in the second member is *ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ*; xxv. 14 *ἐκάλεσε τοὺς ἰδίους δούλους*, Tit. ii. 9; Jno. i. 42. So *οἱ ἴδιοι ἄνδρες*, husbands, in Eph. v. 22; Tit. ii. 5; 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, where *οἱ ἄνδρες* with or without a personal pronoun was sufficient; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 2.[1] Yet on the whole this usage is but rare, and from Greek authors no appropriate
167 instance can be produced; for all that has been quoted by Schwarz, Comment. p. 687, and Weiske, de pleon. p. 62, is unsatisfactory or at most but plausible; so also D. S. 5, 40. Occasionally, *vice versa*, *σφέτερος* is found for *ἴδιος*; see Wessel. Diod. S. II. 9. On the other hand, the Fathers undoubtedly sometimes employ *ἴδιος* for the personal pronoun, cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 622 a.

In by far the greater number of passages in which *ἴδιος* is used, there is an antithesis either evident or concealed; as, Jno. x. 3; v. 18; Matt. xxv. 15; Acts ii. 6; Rom. viii. 32; xi. 24; xiv. 4, 5; 1 Thess. ii. 14; Heb. ix. 12; xiii. 12, also Matt. ix. 1. The parallels in 1 Cor. vii. 2 *ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν*
146 *ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω* mean: *let each man have his wife, and let each*
5th ed. *woman have her own husband.* Isocr. Demon. p. 18 *σκόπει πρῶτον, πῶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ διῴκησεν· ὁ γὰρ κακῶς διανοηθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων* etc. Böhme, Kühnöl, and others, improperly regard *ἴδιος* in Heb. vii. 27 also, as used for the simple possessive pronoun; to *ἰδίαι ἁμαρτίαι* there, *αἱ τοῦ λαοῦ* (as *ἀλλοτρίαι*) are expressly opposed; cf. also iv. 10. When *ἴδιος*, as in Tit. i. 12 *ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης* (Wisd. xix. 12), is added to a personal pronoun, the pronoun merely expresses the idea of possession (*their* poet), and *ἴδιος* makes the antithesis, their *own* (not a foreign) poet. Similarly in Aeschin. Ctesiph. 294 c.; Xen. Hell. 1, 4, 13; Plato, Menex. 247 b. See Lob. Phryn. p. 441; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 70.

Κατά with the Acc. of a personal pronoun is considered as a circumlocution for the possessive pronoun, as Eph. i. 15 *ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις your faith*, Acts xvii. 28 *οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιηταί*, xviii. 15 *νόμος ὁ καθ' ὑμᾶς*, xxvi. 3,
140 etc. This is in the main correct; it results, however, quite naturally from
5th ed. the signification of *κατά*: *ἡ καθ' ὑμᾶς πίστις* is properly *fides quae ad vos*

[1] *Mey.* attributes to these passages an emphasis which is either quite out of place (Matt. xxv. 14), or which could have been fully expressed by the pronoun. Even this strengthening of the pronoun by *ἴδιος* where there is no trace of an antithesis is foreign to the classics.

pertinet, apud vos (*in vobis*) *est;* cf. Aelian. 2, 12 ἡ κατ' αὐτὸν ἀρετή, Dion. H. I. 235 οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοι. Cf. § 30, 3, note 5, p. 193.

Note 1. The Genitive of the personal pronouns, especially μοῦ and σοῦ (more rarely ὑμῶν, ἡμῶν, αὐτοῦ), is, even when no particular emphasis is intended, very often[1] put *before* the governing substantive (and its Article); as, Matt. ii. 2; vii. 24; viii. 8; xvi. 18; xvii. 15; xxiii. 8; Mark v. 30; ix. 24; Rom. xiv. 16; Phil. ii. 2; iv. 14; Col. ii. 5; iv. 18; 1 Cor. viii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 16; iii. 10, 13; 2 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 15; 2 Tim. i. 4; Philem. 5; Luke vi. 47; xii. 18; xv. 30; xvi. 6; xix. 35, etc. Jno. ii. 23; iii. 19, 21, 33; iv. 47; ix. 11, 21, 26; xi. 32; xii. 40; xiii. 1, etc. 168
1 Jno. iii. 20; Rev. iii. 1, 2, 8, 15; x. 9; xiv. 18; xviii. 5, etc. This takes place even in connection with a preposition; as, Jno. xi. 32 ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς πόδας; yet in many such passages variants are noted. See, in general, Gersdorf as above, 456 ff.

The Gen. of the pronoun is *designedly* put before the substantive, a. for emphasis, Eph. ii. 10 αὐτοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν ποίημα, more emphatic than ἐσμὲν γὰρ π. αὐτοῦ, Luke xii. 30; xxii. 53; b. for the sake of contrast, 1 Cor. ix. 11 μέγα, εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσομεν, Phil. iii. 20; c. when the Gen. belongs to *two* nouns,[2] Jno. xi. 48 ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, Acts xxi. 11; Luke xii. 35; Rev. ii. 19; 2 Cor. viii. 4; 2 Tim. iii. 10; Tit. i. 15; 1 Thess. i. 3; ii. 19 (D. S. 11, 16). (The form ἐμοῦ depending on a noun, and placed after it, occurs only in such combinations as Rom. i. 12 πίστεως ὑμῶν τε καὶ ἐμοῦ, xvi. 13 μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμοῦ.) The insertion of a personal pronoun between an article and a noun, as in 2 Cor. xii. 19 ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς, xiii. 9; i. 6, occurs on the whole but rarely. Cf. in general, 147
Krüger, Xen. Anab. 5, 6, 16. 7th ed.

When the noun is preceded by an adjective, the Genitive of the personal pronoun if placed before the noun is inserted between it and the adjective; as, 2 Cor. v. 1 ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία, 2 Cor. iv. 16 ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος.

Note 2. The Dative of the personal pronouns in easy and familiar speech is sometimes in Greek and Hebrew (just as it is with us) apparently superfluous (dativus ethicus, Bttm. 120, 2, and Dem. Mid. p. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 138). As instances of this usage from the N. T. — where certainly it might have been expected — are enumerated sometimes Matt. xxi. 5, a quotation from the Old Test., sometimes Matt. xxi. 2; Rev. ii. 5, 16; Heb. x. 34. But in the first of these last three passages, ἀγάγετέ μοι means *bring him to me*, and ἀγάγετε alone would have been defective. In Rev. ii. ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ signifies *I will come* (punishing, cf. 14 ἔχω κατὰ

[1] Ὁ πατήρ μου and ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός is the usual order even in the N. T. Likewise the Gen. of αὐτός is regularly (see, however, *Rost* p. 459) put after the substantive.

[2] When this arrangement is not adopted, the pronoun must, for perspicuity, be repeated, Acts iv. 28 ὅσα ἡ χείρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή σου προώρισε, etc. Matt. xii. 47; from the Sept., Luke xviii. 20; Acts ii. 17.

σοῦ ὀλίγα, and 16 μετανόησον) *to thee*, on thee (ἐπὶ σέ iii. 3) *quickly*.[1] In
141 the third passage ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς ὕπαρξιν means *repositam* or *destinatam sibi*
6th ed. *habere, for themselves*, as belonging to themselves. Even in Matt. xxi. 5 σοί is not without force.

Note 3. Likewise ἡ ψυχή μου, σου, etc., is commonly regarded as a circumlocution for the personal pronoun (Weiske, Pleon. p. 72 sq.), now in quotations from the Old Test., as Matt. xii. 18; Acts ii. 27; Heb. x. 38, now in the N. T. itself, and this use of the word is usually considered as a Hebraism (Gesen. Lg. S. 752 f.; Vorst, Hebr. p. 121 sq.; Rück. on Rom.
169 xiii. 1). In no passage of the N. T., however, does ψυχή stand completely devoid of meaning, any more than נֶפֶשׁ in Hebrew (see my edition of Simonis); it signifies *the soul* (the spiritual principle on which Christianity operates 1 Pet. i. 9) in such expressions as 2 Cor. xii. 15 ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, 1 Pet. ii. 25 ἐπίσκοπος τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, Heb. xiii. 17, or the *heart* (the seat of the affections and desires), as in Rev. xviii. 14 ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς ψυχῆς σου, Matt. xxvi. 38 περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου, Acts ii. 43 ἐγένετο πάσῃ ψυχῇ φόβος. Even in Rom. ii. 9 ψυχή is not a mere redundancy; it denotes that in man which *feels* the θλῖψις and στενοχωρ., even should these come upon the body. In Rom. xiii. 1 πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἐξουσίαις ὑπερεχούσαις ὑποτασσέσθω, the words πᾶσα ψυχή standing thus alone (cf. 1 Pet. iii. 20) may mean *every soul*, i.e. every person; but even in an enumeration of the inhabitants in any place, so many "*souls*" (Lat. *capita*) is not precisely the same as so many "men" (persons). Cf. also Acts lii. 23 Sept. And so the use of the word ψυχή contributes everywhere to vivacity or circumstantiality of discourse, which is totally different from pleonasm. Besides, ψυχή is not unfrequently so used in Greek authors also (cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 1, 27; Aelian. 1. 32), particularly the poets (Soph.
148 Philoct. 714; Oed. Col. 499, 1207);[2] and this use must be deemed not
7th ed. a Hebraism, but a relic of antique vivacity of expression. See further Georgi, Vind. p. 274; Schwarz, ad Olear. p. 28; Comment. p. 1439.[3]

[1] See on the similar phrase ἥκω σοι *Hm.* Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 179 (e.g. Lucian. pisc. 16 ἥξω ὑμῖν ἐκδικάσασα τὴν δίκην). It is a sort of dativus incommodi, § 31, 4 b.; cf. 1 Kings xv. 20. LXX.

[2] In these passages it is easy to discern the notion of *anima*, and I do not know why *Ellendt*, Lexic. Soph. II. 979, takes ψυχή here for a mere circumlocution. Likewise the passages from Plato which *Ast*, Lexic. Plat. III. 575, quotes, are deprived of their peculiar shade of meaning by the canon: orationem amplificat.

[3] Matt. vi. 25, where ψυχή is opposed to σῶμα, can present no difficulty to any one acquainted with the anthropological notions of the Jews. Likewise καρδία is not a mere circumlocution in Acts xiv. 17 ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς κ. εὐφροσύνης τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, and Jas. v. 5 ἐθρέψατε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν, for otherwise it would have been possible to say, *he smote his heart*, for *him*, etc. Yet καρδία is probably used here not merely — as לֵב is sometimes — in a material sense, agreeably to the physiological views of antiquity. *to strengthen the heart*, i.e. primarily the stomach, and through that the heart (even in Greek the signification *stomach* in καρδία has not altogether disappeared), but includes the idea of the pleasures of eating; see *Baumgarten* on the latter passage.

§ 23. THE DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUN.

142
6th ed.

1. The pronoun *οὗτος* sometimes refers, not to the noun locally nearest, but to one more remote, which, as the principal subject, was *mentally* the nearest, the most present to the writer's thoughts (Schaef. Demosth. V. 322; Stallb. Plat. Phaedr. p. 28, 157; Foertsch, obs. in Lysiam p. 74); as, Acts iv. 11 *οὗτός* (*Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* verse 10, the nearest preceding noun being *ὁ θεός*) *ἐστιν ὁ λίθος*, 1 Jno. v. 20 *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός*, that is, *ὁ θεός*, not *Χριστός* (which immediately precedes) as the older theologians on doctrinal considerations maintained; for in the first place, *ἀληθινὸς θεός* is a constant and exclusive epithet of the Father; and secondly, a warning against idolatry follows, and *ἀληθινὸς θεός* is invariably contrasted with *εἴδωλα*. A passage admitting of question is Acts viii. 26 *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος*, where some supply the nearest subject 170
Γάζα, and others *ὁδός*, see Kühnöl in loc. and my bibl. RWB. I. S. 395; I prefer the latter decidedly. The construction is more obvious in Acts vii. 19; 2 Jno. 7. (For examples from Greek prose, see Ast, Plat. Polit. 417; legg. p. 77.) On the other hand, *ἐκεῖνος* in Acts iii. 13 must be referred to the nearest subject (Bremi, Lys. p. 154; Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 73; Foertsch, as above; Krü. 118). So also in Jno. vii. 45, where *ἐκεῖνοι* denotes the members of the Sanhedrim (*ἀρχιερ. καὶ Φαρισ.*) grouped together (by the use of a single Article) as *one* body. For *οὗτος* and *ἐκεῖνος* so connected that the former refers to the more remote subject and the latter to the nearer, see Plut. vit. Dem. 3. (For *ἐκεῖνος* where only *one* subject is spoken of and *οὗτος*, or simply *αὐτός*, was to be expected, see 2 Cor. viii. 9; Tit. iii. 7.)

In Phil. i. 18 *καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω*, the demonstrative points merely to the 149
main thought *Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται*; and in 2 Pet. i. 4 *διὰ τούτων* refers 7th ed.
to *ἐπαγγέλματα*.

The Relative also is sometimes thought to refer thus to a more remote subject (cf. Bhdy. 297; Göller, Thuc. II. 21; Siebelis, Pausan. III. 52; Schoem. Isae. p. 242 sq.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. 369, and, in regard to Latin, Kritz, Sallust. II. 115) e.g. in 1 Cor. i. 8 (Pott, in loc.) where *ὅς* is referred to *θεός* as the principal subject vs. 4, though *Ἰησ. Χριστ.* immediately precedes. This, however, is not necessary, either on account of *τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησ. Χρ.* at the end of the vs. (cf. Col. ii. 11; Eph. iv. 12), or of *πιστὸς ὁ θεός* immediately following; for what is here asserted of God, the calling *εἰς κοινωνίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, is at the same time a calling to *βεβαιοῦσθαι* through Christ, which can take place only in the fellowship

of Christ. To evade antiquarian difficulties this rule has been applied also to Heb. ix. 4 (see Kühnöl in l.), and on doctrinal grounds to ἐφ' ᾧ in Rom. v. 12, but in both cases very erroneously. In Heb. v. 7, and 2 Thess. ii. 9 there is no difficulty. In 2 Pet. iii. 12 δι' ἣν can very well be referred
143 to the nearest noun ἡμέρας, and ᾧ in 1 Pet. iv. 11 to the principal subject
8th ed. θεός. On Heb. iii. 6 οὗ οἶκος modern expositors are correct.

2. A demonstrative pronoun preceding a relative clause, if it has no special emphasis, is usually included in the relative pronoun (Krü. 124 f.). This occurs not only

a. When, if expressed, it would regularly or by attraction stand
171 in the same case with the relative, as *α*) Acts i. 24 *ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω* for *τοῦτον ὅν*, Rom. viii. 29; Jno. xviii. 26 *συγγενὴς ὧν οὗ ἀπέκοψεν Πέτρος τὸ ὠτίον*, 1 Cor. vii. 39; 2 Cor. xi. 12; Phil. iv. 11; *β*) Acts viii. 24 *ὅπως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὧν εἰρήκατε* for *τούτων ἃ εἰρ.* xxi. 19; xxii. 15; xxvi. 16, 22; Luke ix. 36; Rom. xv. 18; Eph. iii. 20; 2 Cor. xii. 17; cf. Isa. ii. 8; Wisd. xii. 14; Tob. i. 8; xii. 2, 6. Plato, Gorg. 457 e.; Phaed. 94 c.; Isocr. Phil. p. 226, and de pace 388; Plut. virt. mul. p. 202; Xen. A. 1, 9, 25; Dem. ep. 5 in. and Olyn. I. p. 2 a.; Ellendt, Lex. Soph. II. 368. But also,

b. When the demonstrative would require a different case, as Jno. xiii. 29 *ἀγόρασον ὧν χρείαν ἔχομεν* (*ταῦτα ὧν*), Rom. vi. 16; Matt. xix. 11; Acts viii. 19; xiii. 37; 1 Cor. xv. 36; 2 Pet. i. 9, cf. Xen. C. 6, 2, 1 *ἀπήγγειλας ὧν ἐδέου*, Eurip. Med. 735 *ἐμμένειν ἅ σου κλύω* i.e. *τούτοις ἅ*, see Elmsley in loc.; Lysias p. 152 Steph. *μὴ καταγιγνώσκετε ἀδικίαν τοῦ ... δαπανῶντος ἀλλ' ὅσοι ... εἰθισμένοι εἰσὶν ἀναλίσκειν* for *τούτων ὅσοι*, see Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 139; cf. Kritz, Sallust. II. 301. And in this instance even the preposition on which the case of the demonstrative depends is also omitted; as, Rom. x. 14 *πῶς πιστεύσουσιν οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν* i.e. *εἰς τοῦτον οὗ*, etc.[1]

150 If, when the demonstrative before the relative is omitted, a
7th ed. preposition precedes, the preposition belongs logically either,

a) To the relative clause; as, Rom. x. 14 *πῶς ἐπικαλέσονται εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν*, vi. 21 *τίνα καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε* (viz. *τούτων*) *ἐφ' οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε*,[2] xiv. 21; Jno. xix. 37 (Sept.); Luke v. 25;

[1] Similar to this would be 1 Tim. ii. 10 *ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν*, if we unite with *Matthies* in resolving *ἀλλ' ὅ* into *ἀλλ' ἐν τούτῳ ὃ πρ.* But it is simpler and easier to explain the passage by joining *δι' ἔργων* with *κοσμεῖν* verse 9. Had Paul intended to convey the former meaning, he would have expressed himself distinctly by writing *ἐν ᾧ πρέπει* etc.

[2] *Reiche* has obviously stated more than the truth in asserting that in all other instances the only demonstrative omitted, is one governed by a verb, and never one gov-

2 Pet. ii. 12;[1] Soph. Phil. 957; Aristot. rhet. 2, 1, 7; Isocr. Demon. p. 2. Or,

b) To the demonstrative understood; as, Jno. vi. 29 *ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος*, xvii. 9; Rom. xiv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 10; xii. 6; Gal. i. 8 f.; Heb. v. 8 (Num. vi. 21). Also Heb. ii. 18 *ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθείς, δύναται τοῖς πειραζομένοις βοηθῆσαι* might be resolved thus: *ἐν τούτῳ ὃ πέπονθεν . . . δύναται . . . βοηθῆσαι*. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 6, 34 *ἐγγίγνεται εὔνοια πρὸς οὓς ἂν ὑπολάβω εὐνοϊκῶς ἔχειν πρὸς ἐμέ*, Anab. 1, 9, 25; Hell. 4, 8, 33; Demosth. Con. p. 729 a.; Olynth. I. p. 2; ep. 4 p. 118 b.; Plato, rep. 2, 375 d.; and Phaed. 61 c.; Arrian. Alex. 6, 4, 3; Diog. L. 9, 67; 6, 74. Or, 144 6th ed. 172

c) To both clauses; as, 2 Cor. ii. 3 *ἵνα μὴ λύπην ἔχω ἀφ' ὧν ἔδει με χαίρειν*, 1 Cor. vii. 39; x. 30; Jno. xi. 6; Rom. xvi. 2 (cf. Isocr. Evag. p. 470 *πλείους ἐν τούτοις τοῖς τόποις διατρίβειν, ἢ παρ' οἷς πρότερον εἰωθότες ἦσαν*. Cic. Agrar. 2, 27). Also 1 Cor. vii. 1, and Phil. iv. 11 may be so construed.

Relative Adverbs, in like manner, often include definite; as, Jno. xi. 32 *ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (i.e. *ἐκεῖσε ὅπου*), vi. 62; Mark v. 40 *εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον* (cf. Bttm. Philoct. p. 107), 1 Cor. xvi. 6; Matt. xxv. 24 *συνάγων ὅθεν οὐ διεσκόρπισας* for *ἐκεῖθεν ὅπου*, cf. Thuc. 1, 89. Still more free is the construction in Jno. xx. 19 *τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταί* etc.

It has already been mentioned, that in such condensed sentences (where a Greek would not properly supply a demonstrative, Krü. 124) a comma should not be inserted before the relative. In Jno. vi. 29 a comma would be absurd.

3. In emphatic passages the demonstrative is repeated in connected clauses several times in succession; as, Acts vii. 35 *τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν . . . τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀπέσταλκεν . . . οὗτος ἐξήγαγον . . . οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς ὁ εἰπας . . . οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ γενόμενος ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ* etc.; and, in a different spirit, Jno. vi. 42 *οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ . . . πῶς οὖν λέγει οὗτος* etc. See Bornem. bibl. Stud. der sächs. Geistl. I. 66 f., who, among other passages, quotes as parallel Xen. M. 4, 2, 28 *καὶ οἵ τε ἀποτυγχάνοντες τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιθυμοῦσι τούτους ὑπὲρ αὑτῶν βουλεύεσθαι, καὶ προίστασθαί τε ἑαυτῶν τούτους, καὶ τὰς ἐλπίδας τῶν ἀγαθῶν* 151 7th ed.

erned by a noun; cf. Jno. xviii. 26; Luke xxiii. 41. Besides, were the assertion correct, it would prove nothing against the above explanation, see *Fr.* Moreover, *ἐφ' οἷς* might perhaps also be taken in the sense discussed by *Weber*, Demosth. p. 492.

[1] Ἀγνοεῖν ἐν Porphyr. abst. 2, 53. Some also refer to this head Rom. vii. 6, supplying ἐκείνῳ (νόμῳ) before ἐν ᾧ; but ἐν ᾧ refers back to ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, and ἀποθαν. is annexed absolutely to denote the *modus* of κατηργ. See *Philippi.*

ἐν τούτοις ἔχουσι καὶ διὰ πάντα ταῦτα πάντων μάλιστα τούτους ἀγαπῶσιν. From Latin cf. Cic. Verr. 3, 9, 23 *hunc* in omnibus stupris, *hunc* in fenorum expilationibus, *hunc* in impuris conviviis principem adhibebat (Verres). This Anaphora occurs with a relative adjective in Phil. iv. 8 ὅσα ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, ὅσα σεμνά, ὅσα δίκαια, ὅσα ἁγνά, ὅσα προσφιλῆ, ὅσα εὔφημα; cf., further, § 65.

4. It is far more common to repeat οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος in the same clause after the subject, or the predicate if it precedes; the pronoun is inserted immediately before (more rarely after) the verb.
173 This occurs when the subject (or predicate) consists of several words and is to be made more perspicuous or emphatic; as, Matt. xxiv. 13 ὁ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται, Jno. i. 18 ὁ μονογενὴς υἱὸς ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο, Mark vii. 15 τὰ ἐκπορευόμενα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνά ἐστι τὰ κοινοῦντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον, vii. 20; xii. 40; 1 Cor. vi. 4 τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τούτους καθίζετε, Rom. vii. 10, 15 f. 19 f.; ix. 6, 8; xiv. 14; Jno. v. 11;
145 xii. 48; Phil. i. 22 etc.; cf. Thuc. 4, 69 (Xen. conv. 8, 33; Ages.
6th ed. 4, 4); Plato, Protag. p. 339 d.; Isocr. Evag. c. 23; Paus. 1, 24, 5; Lucian. fug. 3; Ael. 12, 19, etc. See Schaef. Melet. p. 84; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 78, 144, and Lucian. Alex. p. 7; Siebelis, Pausan. I. 63; Weber, Demosth. 158. As to Latin see Kritz, Sallust. I. 171. (The further strengthening of such emphasis by δὲ — Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 152; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 252 — does not occur in the N. T. Neither do the sacred writers exhibit any trace of that consequent anacoluthon which is not infrequent in the classics — Schwarz, de discipulor. Chr. soloecism. p. 77 —; unless one choose to refer the attraction in 1 Pet. ii. 7 to this head.)

Still more frequently are these pronouns thus used after a protasis beginning with a conjunction or a relative; as, Jno. ix. 31 ἐάν τις θεοσεβὴς ᾖ καὶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ποιῇ, τούτου ἀκούει, Jas. i. 23; Matt. v. 19; xii. 50; Phil. iii. 7; iv. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 2.

The repetition of the demonstrative pronoun in Luke xix. 2 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἀρχιτελώνης καὶ οὗτος ἦν πλούσιος, is deserving of attention. The meaning is: he was a chief publican and besides (as such) was rich, *isque* dives fuit (Mtth. 1040); Lchm. has adopted from B the reading καὶ αὐτὸς (ἦν) πλ., which has less to recommend it. Cf., also, Xen. Cyr. 8, 3, 48.

The case is different when, for the sake of perspicuity, in a lengthened sentence, a preceding substantive is again brought under the notice of the reader by means of a pronoun; as, 2 Cor. xii. 2 οἶδα ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ ... πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων ... εἴτε ἐν σώματι ... ἁρπαγέντα τὸν τοιοῦτον
152 etc. (Plato, rep. 3, 398; Xen. C. 1, 3, 15) 1 Cor. v. 3, 5; Acts i. 21 f.
7th ed. cf. § 22, 4, p. 147.

5. A demonstrative pronoun is often placed before ὅτι, ἵνα, and similar particles, to give special prominence to the clause that follows (particularly in Paul and John); as, 1 Tim. i. 9 εἰδὼς τοῦτο, ὅτι etc. Acts xxiv. 14 ὁμολογῶ τοῦτό σοι, ὅτι etc. Rom. vi. 6;[1] 1 Cor. i. 12; xv. 50; 2 Cor. v. 15; x. 7, 11; 2 Thess. iii. 10; Phil. 174
i. 6, 25; Jno. xvii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 20; 1 Jno. i. 5; iii. 11, 23; iv. 9, 10; v. 3, 11, 14; 2 Jno. 6; cf. Plato, Soph. 234 b. So εἰς τοῦτο before ἵνα Acts ix. 21; Rom. xiv. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 9; Eph. vi. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 9; 1 Jno. iii. 8, ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι 1 Jno. iv. 13, ἐν τούτῳ ἵνα Jno. xv. 8; 1 Jno. iv. 17 (see Lücke in loc.), ἐν τούτῳ ἐάν 1 Jno. ii. 3, ἐν τούτῳ ὅταν 1 Jno. v. 2; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 461; Franke, Demosth. p. 40.

Likewise when an Infinitive (Mtth. Eurip. Phoen. 520; Sprachl. 1046) or a noun follows as predicate, a demonstrative is employed for emphasis; as, 2 Cor. ii. 1 ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλθεῖν, vii. 11 αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ θεὸν λυπηθῆναι, 1 Cor. vii. 37; Eph. iv. 17; Jas. i. 27 (cf. Xen. Hell. 4, 1, 2, and Ages. 1, 8; Plat. Hipp. mai. 302 a.; Gorg. 491 d.; Isocr. Evag. c. 3; Porphyr. abstin. 1, 13; Dion. H. VI. 667, and de Thuc. 40, 3; Epict. enchir. 31, 1 and 4; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 261); 2 Cor. xiii. 9 τοῦτο καὶ εὔχομαι, τὴν ὑμῶν κατάρτισιν, 1 Jno. iii. 24; 146
v. 4 (cf. Achill. Tat. 7, 2 φάρμακον αὐτῷ τοῦτο τῆς ... λύπης ἡ πρὸς 6th ed.
ἄλλον εἰς τὸ παθεῖν κοινωνία, Plat. rep. 3, 407 a.; Lucian. navig. 3; Eurip. suppl. 510; cf. Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 136; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 466).

Even εἰς τοῦτο is so used, as Acts xxvi. 16 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ὤφθην σοι προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα etc., and οὕτως 1 Pet. ii. 15 (1 Cor. iv. 1), and ἐντεῦθεν Jas. iv. 1.

Lastly, a demonstrative is thus prefixed to a participial construction; as, Mark xii. 24 οὐ διὰ τοῦτο πλανᾶσθε, μὴ εἰδότες τὰς γραφάς etc., *for this cause ... because ye know not* etc.; cf. Antiphon 6, 46 οὐκ ἀπεγράφοντο τούτου αὐτοῦ ἕνεκα, οὐχ ἡγούμενοί με ἀποκτεῖναι etc., see Maetzner, Antiph. p. 219; Schoem. Isaeus p. 370.

The use of the demonstrative pronoun in such expressions as Acts i. 5 οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας *after (in) a few days*, is easily explained. It does not depend, as Kühnöl thinks, on a transposition of πολύς, but is to be explained like the Latin ante *hos* quinque dies, etc.; cf. in Greek ὡς ὀλίγων πρὸ τούτων ἡμερῶν (Achill. Tat. 7, 14), οὐ πρὸ πολλῶν τῶνδε ἡμερῶν (Heliod. 2, 22, 97). Αὗται ἡμέραι are, these very days just past; and ante *hos* quinque dies strictly means: before these (reckoning from the present

[1] In Rom. ii. 3 an amplified Voc. intervenes between τοῦτο and the clause with ὅτι.

time) last past five days. The demonstrative, therefore, connects the
153 period specified with the *present*. Expositors and lexicographers are
7th ed. able to explain the force of the demonstrative in Jas. iv. 13 πορευσώμεθα εἰς τήνδε τὴν πόλιν *into such and such a city*, only by a reference to the well-known ὁ δεῖνα; but ὅδε is also used by the Greeks in exactly the same way, e.g. Plutarch. Symp. 1, 6, 1 τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν *such and such a day*. [The full and ordinary demonstrative signification, however, is claimed, both for the passage in James and for that in Plutarch, by Bttm. Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 90; and Huther on James, 2nd. ed., agrees with him.]

175 The Plur. ταῦτα is not unfrequently in Greek employed in reference to a *single* object, and stands therefore, strictly taken, for τοῦτο (Plat. Apol. 19 d.; Phaedr. 70 d.; Xen. Cyr. 5, 3, 19; see Schaef. Dion. p. 80; cf. also Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 524; Stallb. Plat. Apol. p. 19 d.; Maetzner, Antiphon p. 153).[1] Instances of this in the N. T. are 3 Jno. 4 (where several Codd. give the correction ταύτης) see Lücke, and also Jno. i. 51; but undoubtedly not Jno. xix. 36, see van Hengel, annotat. p. 85 sq.; in Luke xii. 4 the adverbial phrase μετὰ ταῦτα means *afterwards*. Nearly the same is to be said of the well known καὶ ταῦτα, *idque*, Heb. xi. 12. On 1 Cor. ix. 15 see Mey.[2] In 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτα may have a contemptuous secondary signification: καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, *and such a set*, talis farinae homines (Bhdy. 281; Stallb. Plat. Rival. p. 274); yet perhaps this was far from the apostle's thought, and ταῦτα is frequently used in reference to a series of predicates: *of such a description*, ex hoc genere fuistis; Kypke and Pott in loc. have blended things quite dissimilar.

147 In 1 Jno. v. 20 Lücke thinks he finds a prozeugma of the demonstrative
6th ed. pronoun (cf. also Stud. und Kritik. II. S. 147 ff.): οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς, καὶ (αὕτη) ζωὴ αἰώνιος, — not impossible, but in my opinion unnecessary.

Note. Respecting the *position* of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος, it must be remarked that the former, from the nature of the case, usually stands *before*, and the latter *after*, the substantive; as, οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος. Yet the opposite order also occurs in the case of οὗτος (Matt. xxviii. 15 ὁ λόγος οὗτος. Luke i. 29 etc.) without essential difference of meaning, with ἐκεῖνος (Luke xii. 47; Heb. iv. 11) particularly in the connecting phrases ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ or ὥρᾳ, ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ (Gersdorf 433). It must not, however, be imagined that a writer has so committed himself to the *one* arrangement, that the other should be altered when it is confirmed by approved Codd. or by the sense.

[1] *Fritzsche*, quaestion. Lucian. p. 126, qualifies this remark as follows: Plur. poni de una re tantummodo sic, si neque ulla emergat ambiguitas et aut universe, non definite quis loquatur, aut una res plurium vi sit praedita.

[2] In the same way ἐφ' οἷς and ἀνθ' ὧν are used in Greek, where the Sing. would suffice. *Fr.* Rom. I. 299.

§ 24. THE RELATIVE PRONOUN.

154 7th ed.

1. In accordance with the law of attraction (cf. Hm. Vig. 891 sqq.; Bhdy. 299 ff.),[1] the relative pronoun ὅς (never in the N. T. ὅστις),[2] which by reason of the governing verb should stand in the Accusative, is so drawn by the oblique case (Gen. or Dative) of the 176 preceding noun with which it has a logical connection (that of a subordinate with a principal clause), as to pass over into this oblique case. This peculiar construction, which gives a sentence more internal unity and a certain periodic compactness, was frequent even in the Sept., and in the N. T. it regularly occurs (though not everywhere without var.); as, Luke ii. 20 *ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἤκουσαν*, Jno. ii. 22 (iv. 50) *ἐπίστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν*, Acts iii. 21, 25; vii. 17; x. 39; xvii. 31; xx. 38; xxii. 10; Jas. ii. 5; 1 Pet. iv. 11; Jno. vii. 31, 39; xv. 20; xvii. 5; Mark vii. 13; Luke v. 9; xix. 37; Matt. xviii. 19; 1 Cor. vi. 19; 2 Cor. x. 13; xii. 21; 2 Thess. i. 4; Tit. iii. 6; Heb. vi. 10 (ix. 20); x. 1; Eph. i. 8; ii. 10; Rev. xviii. 6, etc. (in all which cases the comma in the text before the relative is to be rejected, see § 7, 1). Jude 15 *περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν ἠσέβησαν* deserves particular attention, see § 32, 1, p. 222.

There are, however, passages in which this construction is neglected; as, Heb. viii. 2 *τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς, ἣν ἔπηξεν ὁ κύριος*, and, according to good Codd., Mark xiii. 9; Jno. vii. 39; iv. 50; Tit. iii. 5. Besides, compare the var. in Jno. xvii. 11; Heb. vi. 10; Acts vii. 16; Rev. i. 20. So frequently in the Sept. and the Apocrypha (Wahl, clav. p. 360), likewise in Greek authors; see Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 30; Weber, Dem. 543; Krü. 121.

Eph. i. 6 *τῆς χάριτος ἧς ἐχαρίτωσεν* (var. *ἐν ᾗ*), iv. 1 *τῆς κλήσεως ἧς* 148 *ἐκλήθητε*, 2 Cor. i. 4 *διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς παρακαλούμεθα*,[3] where *ἧς* seems 6th ed. to stand for *ἣν*, appear to transcend the above rule. But these passages may be accounted for by the well-known expressions *κλῆσιν καλεῖν, παράκλησιν παρακαλεῖν, χάριν χαριτοῦν, ἀγάπην ἀγαπᾶν* (§ 32, 2), and by the equally well-known construction of the Passive; see Gieseler in Rosenm.

[1] Cf. also the thorough treatise of *G. T. A. Krüger* (relating more directly to Latin) in his Untersuch. a. d. Gebiete der lat. Sprachlehre. 3 Hefte. Braunschw. 1827, 8vo.; *K. W. Krüger*, in his Sprachl. 121, prefers the term *assimilation*.

[2] The form *ὅστις* occurs in the N. T. only as nominative.

[3] Here, however, we may, with *Wahl*, consider the Gen. as dependent on the omitted preposition *διά*; see § 50, 7, p. 421 sq.

Repertor. II. 124.[1] Also in Acts xxiv. 21 *φωνῆς ἧς ἔκραξα ἑστώς* etc., probably *ἧς* is not used for *ᾗ* (*φωνῇ κράζειν* Matt. xxvii. 50; Mark i. 26;
155 Rev. vi. 10, etc.) cf. Boisson. Nicet. p. 33, but *φωνή* means *cry, exclamation*
7th ed (loud utterance); the construction accordingly resolves itself into the phrase *φωνὴν κράζειν* (Rev. vi. 10 var.), which, though unusual, is not inadmissible; cf. Isa. vi. 4 *φωνῆς ἧς ἐκέκραγον.* (In Eph. i. 8 *ἧς ἐπερίσσευσεν*, the verb is to be taken transitively, as *γνωρίσας* in vs. 9 shows.) That attraction nevertheless may affect even the Dative of the relative (so as
177 to change it into a Gen.) is shown by G. Krüger, as above, 274 f.; cf. Heinichen, Euseb. II. 98 sq. Accordingly Cod. A in 1 Tim. iv. 6 has *τῆς καλῆς διδασκαλίας ἧς παρηκολούθηκας.* Many expositors, too, as recently Fr. also, resolve Rom. iv. 17 *κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσεν θεοῦ* into *κατ. θεοῦ ᾧ ἐπίστ.*; but this is not necessary; see 2 below.[2] On the other hand, Matt. xxiv. 38 *ἦσαν ... γαμοῦντες καὶ ἐκγαμίζοντες ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθε Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτόν* is probably contracted from *ἄχρι τῆς ἡμ. ᾗ εἰσῆλθεν.* Similarly Luke i. 20; Acts i. 2, 22. In Lev. xxiii. 15 *ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας ἧς ἂν προσενέγκητε* etc. Bar. 1, 19, we find the same attraction of the Dative of the relative when the two clauses are not merged into one; for though *ἧς ἡμέρας* (*on which day*) also occurs, yet in the Sept. the Dative of time predominates.

2. Sometimes the opposite construction occurs: that is to say, the noun to which the relative refers is drawn into the construction of the relative clause and put in that case in which the governing verb requires the relative to stand. When this occurs, the noun either

a. Precedes the relative clause; as, 1 Cor. x. 16 *τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος*; Matt. xxi. 42 (LXX.) *λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη*, 1 Pet. ii. 7; Luke xii. 48 *παντὶ ᾧ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ*, probably also Luke i. 72, 73 *μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ, ὅρκον ὃν ὤμοσε πρὸς Ἀβραάμ*, but probably not Acts x. 36, see below § 62, 3. (cf. Gieseler as above, 126; Krü. 224 f.); Or,

b. As respects position also is incorporated directly into the relative clause; as, Mark vi. 16 *ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτός ἐστι*, Philem. 10; Luke xix. 37. Likewise Rom. vi. 17 *ὑπηκούσατε εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς*; this may indeed be resolved into
149 *εἰς τὸν τύπον διδ. ὃν παρ.*, an Acc. with a Passive, for *ὃς παρεδόθη*
8th ed *ὑμῖν* — (for a similar attraction affecting the Acc. of a more remote object see Demosth. Mid. 385 c. *δίκην ἅμα βουλόμενοι λαβεῖν, ὧν ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐτεθέαντο θρασὺν ὄντα*, where *ὧν* is for *ἅ*, i.e. *ἐν οἷς*,

[1] And so, probably, should be taken Aristoph. Plut. 1044 *τάλαιν' ἐγὼ τῆς ὕβρεως ἧς ὑβρίζομαι.*

[2] Cf. *Schmid* in the Tübing. Zeitschr. f. Theol. 1831, II. 137 ff.

to be joined with *θρασ. ὄντα*, and Dion. Hal. 9, 565 *ἀγανάκτησις ὑμῶν περὶ ὧν ὑβρίζεσθε ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων*, Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 b.) — or more simply (as Bornem., Rück., Fr., and others have maintained) *ὑπηκ. (τῷ) τύπῳ διδ. εἰς ὃν παρ.*, since the construction *ὑπακούειν τινί*[1] is the only one admissible here. Some explain even Acts xxi. 16 *ἄγοντες παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν Μνάσωνι* etc. by attraction: *ἄγ. παρὰ Μνάσωνα . . . παρ' ᾧ ξεν.*, yet see § 31, 5. On 2 Cor. x. 13 see § 59, 7, p. 530. 156 7th ed. 178

For both the constructions specified above there are additional parallels: a) Hippocr. morb. 4, 11 *τὰς πηγὰς ἃς ὠνόμασα, αὗται τῷ σώματι* etc., Lysias bon. Arist. p. 649; Aelian. anim. 3, 13; Her. 2, 106; Soph. El. 653, and Trach. 283; Eurip. Bacch. 443 sqq.; Aristoph. Plut. 200; Alciphr. 3, 59, the well-known passage of Virgil (Aen. 1, 577) urbem quam statuo vestra est, Terent. eunuch. 4, 3, 11; Sen. ep. 53; Wetsten. I. 468. From the Sept. Gen. xxxi. 16 *τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἀφείλετο ὁ θεὸς . . . ἡμῖν ἔσται*, Num. xix. 22, and from the Acta Petri et Pauli ed. Thilo I. 7 *ἀρκεῖ ἡμῖν τὴν θλῖψιν ἣν ἔχομεν παρὰ Πέτρου*. b) Xen. A. 1, 9, 19 *εἴ τινα ὁρῴη κατασκευάζοντα ἧς ἄρχοι χώρας* (*χώραν ἧς ἄρχοι*), Soph. Oed. C. 907; El. 1029; Eurip. Orest. 63; Electr. 860, and Hec. 986; Plat. Tim. 49 c.; Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 c.; Plut. Coriol. 9 (Evang. apocr. p. 414; Acta apocr. p. 69); cf. Liv, 9, 2; Terent. Andr. prol. 3. See, in general, Mtth. 1054 f.; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 354.

Under b. would come also Rom. iv. 17 *κατέναντι οὗ ἐπίστευσε θεοῦ*, if it were to be resolved into *κατ. θεοῦ, ᾧ ἐπίστ.* This would be an extension of the attraction, become so common, to the Dative, of which no doubt occasional instances occur, Krü. 247 f. (Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 39 *ἤγετο τῶν ἑαυτοῦ τῶν τε πιστῶν, οἷς ἥδετο καὶ ὧν* (i.e. *τούτων οἷς*) *ἠπίστει πολλούς*); see Fr. Rom. I. 237. But the passage may be explained more simply thus: *κατ. θεοῦ, κατ. οὗ ἐπίστ.* (see above, 1 p. 164). The exposition proposed Bretschn. Lex. man. p. 220 is artificial in more respects than one.

The mere incorporation of the antecedent into the relative clause without a change of case occurred: Matt. xxiv. 44 *ᾗ ὥρᾳ οὐ δοκεῖτε, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται* (Gen. ii. 17; Ex. x. 28; xxxii. 34; Num. vi. 13; xxx. 6), Matt. vii. 2 *ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε, μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν*, Jno. xi. 6; Mark xv. 12 (Heb. xiii. 11); Luke i. 4. Here belongs, too, Rom. iv. 17, see above. The Greeks generally inserted in the subsequent principal clause a corresponding demonstrative, and separated also the relative by some word from the antecedent, Krü. 123.

Attraction with omission of the (demonstrative) word which occasioned it:

[1] On *ὑπακούειν εἰς* particularly in Josephus, see *Kypke*, observatt. II. 167, though exception can be taken to some of his examples.

a. With the intervention of a preposition; as, Heb. v. 8 ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν
150 ἔπαθε, i.e. ἀπὸ τούτων ἃ (ὧν) ἔπαθε, Rom. x. 14; Jno. vi. 29; xvii. 9; 1 Cor.
6th ed. vii. 1 (Demosth. Euerg. 684 b. ἀγανακτήσασα ἐφ' οἷς ἐγὼ ἐπεπόνθειν, Plat. Cratyl. 386 a.; Xen. An. 1, 9, 25; Arrian. Al. 4, 10, 3; Lysias II. 242 ed. Auger.). See § 23, 2. And

b. Without a preposition; as, Rom. xv. 18 οὐ τολμήσω λαλεῖν τι ὧν οὐ κατειργάσατο etc. Acts viii. 24; xxvi. 16 (Soph. Phil. 1227; Oed. R. 855).
179 Cf. § 23, 2; and the same place for attraction with an adverb of place (G. Krü. 302 ff.).

3. Sometimes the relative pronoun agrees in gender and number with the following noun which is predicate in the relative clause
157 (ὅς . . . ἐστί) annexed by way of explanation; (this, too, is a
7th ed. species of attraction, Hm. Vig. 708): Mark xv. 16 τῆς αὐλῆς, ὅ ἐστι πραιτώριον, Gal. iii. 16 τῷ σπέρματί σου, ὅς ἐστι Χριστός, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ, Eph. vi. 17; i. 14; Phil. i. 28; Eph. iii. 13 μὴ ἐκκακεῖν ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶ δόξα ὑμῶν (for ὅ), also 1 Cor. iii. 17 (where Mey., without reason, makes a difficulty about οἵτινες). Cf. also, Rev. iv. 5; v. 6, 8 var. On the other hand, Eph. i. 23 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἥτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. i. 24; ii. 17.

Some have erroneously referred to this head Col. iii. 5 ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία (ἥτις for ἅτινα, viz. μέλη); the reference is only to πλεονεξία (Huther in loc.). In Col. iii. 14 ὅ, the better attested reading, appears to be a pure Neut. without reference to the gender of the preceding or the following noun. On Eph. v. 5 see note 1. In Matt. xxvii. 33, and similar passages, ὅ is *quod* sc. vocabulum. With regard to Heb. ix. 9 expositors are divided in opinion; but most of them now refer ἥτις to ἡ πρώτη σκηνή verse 8, so that this passage does not fall under the above rule. Commentators differ still more widely in reference to Col. i. 27; but it is better to connect ὅς with ὁ πλοῦτος, as the principal noun, than with μυστήριον.

It should seem, then, that the relative conforms to the gender of the following noun mainly when the latter is viewed as the principal subject; consequently, when the *specific* appellations are given of things, which, in the principal clause, were mentioned in general terms (Mark xv.; 1 Tim. iii., cf. Pausan. 2, 13, 4; Cic. pro Sest. 42, 91 domicilia coniuncta quas urbes dicimus), especially with names of persons (Gal. iii., cf. Cic. legg. 1, 7, 22 animal, *quem* vocamus hominem), or where the relative should have been a Neut used absolutely (Eph. iii.). On the other hand, the relative

retains the gender of the noun in the principal clause, when the subordinate clause contains an explanatory amplification, a predicate of the principal object (as in Eph. i.; 1 Cor. iv.); (cf. Bremi on Nep. Thrasyb. 2). See, in general, G. Krü. as above, 90 ff., and, for the Latin, Zumpt, Grammat. § 372; Kritz, Sallust. I. 292.

4. The relative appears to be put for the interrogative in a *direct* question,[1] Matt. xxvi. 50 ἑταῖρε, ἐφ' ὃ (that is, ἐπὶ τί Aristoph. Lysistr. 1101) πάρει. This is an impropriety of declining Hellenism 180
(Schaef. Demosth. V. 285), which Lob. Phryn. p. 57 has substantiated as respects other relative pronouns (Plat. Alcib. 1 p. 110 c.), 151
and which cannot be thought very surprising when the affinity 6th ed.
between the words *qui* and *quis* is considered. This usage is unknown in classic prose. (In Plat. Men. 74 d. recent editors, apparently without MS. authority, have substituted τί. On Plat. rep. 8, 559 a. see Stallb.) But it is not necessary, on this account, to assume (with Mey.) that the above passage contains an aposiopesis, or, with Fr., to take the sentence as an exclamation: vetus 158
sodalis, ad qualem rem perpetrandam ades! By a question Jesus 7th ed.
might effectively call the attention of Judas to the wickedness of his design. (It would be more allowable in Mark ix. 11 λέγοντες· ὅ,τι λέγουσιν οἱ γραμματεῖς etc. to regard ὅ,τι, with Lchm., as put for τί (that is, διὰ τί), just as in Heliod. 4, 16; 7, 14, quoted by Lob. as above, ὅστις is used in a direct question. But ὅ,τι never occurs in the N. T. as an interrogative pronoun (certainly not Jno. viii. 25, see § 54, 1), not even in an indirect question. As ὅτι immediately follows the words quoted above, it might easily have been written by mistake also before λέγουσι for τί, see Fr. If ὅτι, however, be the true reading, it should rather be taken for ὅτι *because*, see § 53, 10, 5, p. 456.)

Note 1. It is peculiar to Paul to connect sometimes two, three, or more clauses by a repetition of the relative pronoun, even when it refers to different subjects; as, Col. i. 24 f., 28, 29; Eph. iii. 11, 12; 1 Cor. ii. 7, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 22. Elsewhere the relative in the Sing. is thought to point to a series of nouns, and to be used, as it were, in a collective sense; as, Eph. v. 5 ὅτι πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης, ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης etc. Cf. Fritzsche de conformat. crit. p. 46. But this is arbitrary, and would suppose just such a forced explanation of Col. iii. 5 (see above).

Note 2. The relative clause beginning with ὅς, ὅστις, is usually placed *after* the clause containing the antecedent; where, however, the former

[1] Ὅς in an indirect question occurs in Soph. Oed. R. 1068; see *Ellendt*, Lexic. Soph. II. 372. Also cf. *Passow*, under the word.

clause is to be made prominent, it is put first (Krü. 123); as, 1 Cor. xiv. 37 ἃ γράφω ὑμῖν ὅτι κυρίου ἐστίν, Heb. xii. 6 ὃν ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παιδεύει, Rom. vi. 2 οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν, Mark viii. 34, etc.; with a demonstrative in the second clause, Phil. iii. 7 ἅτινα ἦν μοι κέρδη, ταῦτα ἥγημαι etc. Jas. ii. 10; Jno. xxi. 25; xi. 45; Matt. v. 39; Luke ix. 50; Acts xxv. 18; 1 Cor. iv. 2; Heb. xiii. 11.

Note 3. The Neut. ὅ before a whole clause, in the sense of *as to* etc. (like *quod* in Latin), occurs in Rom. vi. 10 ὃ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ, Gal. ii. 20 ὃ δὲ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί, ἐν πίστει ζῶ etc. cf. Mtth. II. 1063. In both passages,
181 however, ὅ may also be taken for an objective case: *quod vivit, vita, quam vivit.* See Fr. on Rom. as above.

Note 4. During the reign of empiricism it was believed by many expositors that ὅς is used in prose, besides the well-known cases (Mtth. 742 f.), for the demonstrative. Now, every beginner knows how to construe such passages; e.g. 2 Cor. iv. 6 ὁ θεὸς ὁ εἰπὼν ἐκ σκότους φῶς λάμψαι, ὃς ἔλαμψεν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις etc. In 1 Cor. ii. 9 and Rom. xvi. 27 the construction is anacoluthic.

152 6th ed. § 25. THE INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN, AND THE INDEFINITE PRONOUN ΤΙΣ.

1. Not only is the Interrogative Pronoun τίς, τί ordinarily used, even in *indirect* questions and after verbs of *knowing*, *inquiring*,
159 etc., while ὅστις, ὅ,τι is never so employed in the N. T. (Matt. xx. 22;
7th ed. Luke xxiii. 34 (Mark xiv. 36) Jno. x. 6; Acts xxi. 33; Rom. viii. 26; Col. i. 27, etc.; cf. Xen. C. 1, 1, 6; 1, 3, 17; Mem. 1, 6, 4, etc.; Hm. ad Aeschyl. p. 461; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 823), but τί, in particular, stands even in cases where the Greeks would certainly have used ὅ,τι, so that the interrogative is weakened apparently into the German *was* (Eng. *what*); as, Matt. x. 19 δοθήσεται ὑμῖν ... τί λαλήσετε *quod dicatis*, Luke xvii. 8 ἑτοίμασον, τί δειπνήσω, *para, quod comedam* (not quid comedam, which in this connection would hardly be allowable in Latin), cf. Bhdy. 443. Ὅ,τι occurs once, Acts ix. 6. The transition to this usage of τί appears in the construction Mark vi. 36 τί φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχουσι (Matt. xv. 32), for which with little difference of meaning ὅ,τι φάγωσιν οὐκ ἔχ. might have been employed, exactly as in Latin one may say either *non habent quid comedant* or *non hab. quod com.* (Ramshorn, lat. Gramm. 368). In the latter form of expression, ἔχειν and *habere* simply convey the notion of having or possessing (that which they might eat, they have not); the former comprises the notion of inquiry (accordingly, *habeo quid* must sometimes be directly trans

lated *I know, what*) : inquiring what they should eat, they have nothing (to eat). Similarly Xen. C. 6, 1, 48 *οὐκ ἔχω τί μεῖζον εἴπω*, Hell. 1, 6, 5 ; Soph. Oed. C. 317 *οὐκ ἔχω τί φῶ* ; see, in general, 182
Heindorf, Cic. N. D. p. 347. (The relative and interrogative are combined in 1 Tim. i. 7 *μὴ νοοῦντες μήτε ἃ λέγουσι μήτε περὶ τίνων διαβεβαιοῦνται non intelligentes nec* quod *dicunt nec* quid *asserant.* So in Greek authors are *τί* and *ὅ,τι* coupled in parallel clauses. Cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 248 ; II. 261 ; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 641.)

Schleusner, Haab (S. 82 f.), and others, refer to this usage many examples which are of an entirely different nature ; that is to say, in which a. *τίς* retains its interrogative force, and must be rendered in Latin by *quis* or *quid*, as Matt. vii. 9 *τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος* etc., *quis erit inter vos homo* etc., cf. Matt. xii. 11 ; Luke xiv. 5 ; xi. 5 f. ; or in which b. *τις* is not an interrogative, but the indefinite *aliquis*, as 1 Cor. vii. 18 *περιτετμημένος τις ἐκλήθη, μὴ ἐπισπάσθω, was any one called that is circumcised* (I suppose the case), *let him not become uncircumcised ;* Jas. v. 13 *κακοπαθεῖ τις, προσευχέσθω.* It is inaccurately asserted that *τις* is used here for *εἴ τις.* See appendix, § 64. In Jas. iii. 13 we must punctuate with Pott, Schott, and others, *τίς σοφὸς ... ἐν ὑμῖν ; δειξάτω* etc. Likewise Acts xiii. 25 may be read : *τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι ; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ.* Still, I think the usual acceptation of *τίνα* for *ὄντινα* not to be rejected ; cf. Soph. El. 1167 ; Callim. epigr. 30, 2.

Τίς is used sometimes, when only two persons or things are spoken 153
of, for the more precise *πότερος* (which never occurs in the N. T. as an 6th ed.
adjective) ; as, Matt. ix. 5 *τί γάρ ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον ;* xxi. 31 *τίς ἐκ τῶν δύο ἐποίησε ;* Luke vii. 42 ; xxii. 27 ; Phil. i, 22. This occurs also in Greek authors (Stallb. Phileb. p. 168), who do not make so nice a distinction 160
between *τίς* and *πότερος* as the Romans do between their *quis* and *uter* 7th ed.
(though even as respects these last, exceptions are not wanting).

It ought not to be asserted that in phrases such as Luke xv. 26 *τί εἴη ταῦτα*, Jno. vi. 9 ; Acts xvii. 20, the Sing. of the interrogative is put for the Plur. The Sing. *τί* sums up the plurality into one comprehensive whole : *what* (of what sort) are these things (hence also quid sibi volunt) ? On the other hand, in *τίνα ἐστί* etc. (cf. Heb. v. 12) there is a definite reference to the plurality : quae (qualia) sunt ; cf. Plat. Theaet. 154 e. ; 155 c. (Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101 ; Weber, Dem. 192).

The interrogative *τί* is sometimes placed at the end of the clause ; as, Jno. xxi. 21 *οὗτος δὲ τί ;* The same occurs frequently in the orators with *πῶς* ; Weber, Demosth. 180 sq.

In the N. T. and the Sept. *ἵνα τί for what, wherefore*, is also used as an interrogative ; as, Matt. ix. 4 *ἵνα τί ὑμεῖς ἐνθυμεῖσθε πονηρά ;* xxvii. 46 ; Luke xiii. 7, etc. The expression is elliptical (as *ut quid* in Latin) for : *ἵνα τί γένηται* (after a past tense *γένοιτο*), see Hm. Vig. 849 ; Lob. Soph. 183

Aj. p. 107, and occurs not unfrequently in Greek authors, particularly the later, Plat. apol. 26 d.; Aristoph. eccles. 718; Arrian. Epict. 1, 24 a. (cf. Ruth i. 11, 21; Sir. xiv. 3; 1 Macc. ii. 7).

2. The indefinite pronoun τις, τι is joined to

a. Abstract nouns, in order (among other purposes) to soften their import somewhat; as, Xen. Cyr. 9, 1, 16 τούτους ἡγεῖτο ἢ ἀκρατείᾳ τινὶ ἢ ἀδικίᾳ ἢ ἀμελείᾳ ἀπεῖναι — from a *certain* (a species of) incontinence or injustice, etc., Plut. Coriol. 14. Hence, when an unusual or a too bold figure of speech is used; as, Jas. i. 18 ἀπαρχή τις *quaedam* (quasi) *primitiae*, Bttm. I. 579; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis p. 73.

b. Numerals, when the number is to be taken approximately only, and not precisely; as, Acts xxiii. 23 δύο τινάς *some two* (about two), xix. 14, see Schaef. Demosth. III. 269; Mtth. 1080.

c. Adjectives of quality or quantity, for rhetorical emphasis; as, Heb. x. 27 φοβερά τις ἐκδίκησις *terribilis quaedam* (Klotz on Cic. Lael. p. 142, and Nauck in Jahn's Jahrb. Bd. 52 S. 183 f.), a positively (or very) terrible punishment (cf. Lucian. philop. 8 φοβερόν τι θέαμα, D. S. 5, 39 ἐπίπονός τις βίος, Aeschin. dial. 3, 17; Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 14; 6, 4, 7; Heliod. 2, 23, 99; Lucian. dial. m. 5, 1; Plutarch. Phoc. c. 13, cf. Boisson. Nicet. p. 268); hence Acts viii. 9 μέγας τις *some great* personage (of a man Xen. Eph. 3, 2; Athen. 4, 21, etc.). In these instances τις is equivalent to the emphatic *a* (Germ. *ein: das war eine Freude, das ist ein Mann*): *that was a joy* (a great joy), *that is a man* (a clever man); cf. Acts v. 36 λέγων εἶναί τινα ἑαυτόν pretending *to be somebody* (of
154 importance); see Bhdy. 440; Krü. 129. To this corresponds
8th ed. *quidam* in Latin, and, where no substantive or adjective is to be made prominent, *aliquis;* as, *aliquem esse* Cic. Att. 3, 15. (On
161 the other hand, πᾶς τις does not occur in the N. T. In 1 Cor. ix. 22
7th ed. some would insert it, after a few authorities, instead of πάντως τινάς, see Boisson. Eunap. p. 127; but without necessity, and even without critical probability. In Jno. xi. 49 εἷς τις *unus aliquis* may have been used for emphasis.)

In Matt. xx. 20 the Neut. τι *aliquid* may be used with emphasis for aliquid magni (see Fr. in loc.), but probably not. On the other hand it must be taken so in the phrase εἶναί τι Gal. ii. 6; vi. 3, etc. (the well-known *aliquid esse* in Latin). The emphasis depends on the connection of the passage (cf. Hm. Vig. 731), and is therefore of a rhetorical description. In classic Greek τὶ λέγειν, τὶ πράσσειν, are especially frequent.

Note. When joined to a substantive, τὶς may stand either *before* or *after*

it; as, *τὶς ἀνήρ* and *ἀνήρ τις* Acts iii. 2; v. 1; x. 1. The latter order is the more usual one in the N. T. On the other hand, it has been doubted 184
(Mtth. S. 1081) whether *τὶς* can stand at the very beginning of a proposition; yet Hm. emend. rat. p. 95 makes no objection to this. In the N. T. compare 1 Tim. v. 24 *τινῶν ἀνθρώπων αἱ ἁμαρτίαι πρόδηλοί εἰσιν ... τισὶν δὲ* etc. Acts xvii. 18; xix. 31. The abbreviated forms *του, τῳ* (Bttm. I. 301) are not used in the N. T.; they have been unwarrantably introduced in 1 Cor. xv. 8; 1 Thess. iv. 6.

§ 26. HEBRAISMS IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN PRONOUNS.

1. Instead of *οὐδείς, μηδείς*, we find sometimes in the N. T., according to the Hebrew idiom (Leusden, diall. p. 107; Vorst, Hebr. p. 529 sq.; Gesen. Lg. 831), *οὐ (μὴ) ... πᾶς*, the verb being always connected directly with the negative; as, Matt. xxiv. 22 *οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ*, Rom. iii. 20 *ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ*, Luke i. 37 *οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶν ῥῆμα*, 1 Cor. i. 29 *ὅπως μὴ καυχήσηται πᾶσα σάρξ*, etc., cf. also Rev. xxi. 27 *οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς αὐτὴν πᾶν κοινόν*, Acts x. 14 *οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινόν*, Rev. ix. 4 (Judg. xiii. 4; Susan. 27).

On the other hand, *οὐ πᾶς (μὴ πᾶς)* without an intervening word denotes (like *non omnis*) *not every;* as, 1 Cor. xv. 39 *οὐ πᾶσα σὰρξ ἡ αὐτὴ σάρξ*, Matt. vii. 21 *οὐ πᾶς ὁ λέγων· κύριε, κύριε, εἰσελεύσεται εἰς τὴν βασ. ... ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν*, etc. *not every one that calls me* (readily) *Lord, but* (among such as do so) *only he who doeth the will* etc.;[1] not the mere saying 'Lord' fits for entering 155
the kingdom of heaven, but etc., Acts x. 41. So in the Plur. *οὐ* 66 ed.
πάντες non omnes Matt. xix. 11; Rom. ix. 6; x. 16.

This distinction is founded in the nature of the case: In the 162
former instance *οὐ* negatives the notion of the verb (something 5th ed.
negative is asserted in reference to *πᾶς*: *every man ... will fail to be justified;* the predicate, will not be justified, applies to every man, i.e. *no* man will be justified);[2] but in the latter case *οὐ* negatives the notion of *πᾶς*. On the whole, however, this mode 185

[1] I cannot concur in *Fr.'s* explanation (see also Präliminar. S. 72 f.), according to which *οὐ* is here to be connected with the verb, so as to make the sense, *no Lord-sayer*. The second clause *ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶν* by no means excludes *saying* Lord; *ποιεῖν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου* involves, on the contrary, the acknowledgment of Jesus as Lord.

[2] *Gesenius*, as above, merely sets down this linguistic phenomenon, without troubling himself to explain it. *Ewald*, on the contrary (S. 657), has at least indicated its proper acceptation. See even *Drusius*, ad Gal. ii. 16, and *Beza* on Matt. xxiv. 22; Rom. iii. 20. *Gesenius's* distinction between *οὐ πᾶς* and *μὴ πᾶς* I have never comprehended.

of expression is rare, and, as more expressive, appears to have been purposely adopted in the passages in question, (which are mostly aphoristic sayings). It is confined mostly to the rendering of the O. T. כָּל־בָּשָׂר; whereas the LXX. as translators have it frequently.[1] (What Georgi, Vind. p. 317, adduces to show that this construction is pure Greek, is wholly irrelevant. In all the passages he quotes, *πᾶς* belongs to the substantive in the sense of *whole*, as *μηδὲ τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον*, or *full*, *complete*, *πᾶσα ἀνάγκη*.)[2]

Strictly this Hebraism should be limited to the above expression *οὐ (μή) . . . πᾶς*; for clauses with *πᾶς . . . οὐ (μή)* [3] contain for the most part nothing foreign to the classic idiom,[4] or the reason is obvious why the writer made choice of this particular turn of expression. 1 Jno. ii. 21 *πᾶν ψεῦδος ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν all falsehood (every lie) is not of the truth* any Greek might have written. Jno. iii. 16 *ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ'* etc. (var.) *that every one believing on him may not perish, but*
156 etc. In Eph. v. 5 *πᾶς πόρνος ἢ ἀκάθαρτος ἢ πλεονέκτης . . . οὐκ ἔχει*
6th ed. *κληρονομίαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, the apostle had perhaps at the beginning of the sentence an affirmative predicate in mind
163 (Ezek. xliv. 9). Only in Eph. iv. 29; Rev. xviii. 22, and perhaps
7th ed. Rev. xxii. 3 *οὐδέν* would have been more agreeable to a Greek ear.

186 In Matt. x. 29 (Luke xii. 6) occurs *ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται* (vel) **unum** non, ne unum quidem (contrasted with *δύο*: *two* for an assarion, and **not** even *one*, etc.) Matt. v. 18. This construction (with a negative) occurs

[1] For instance, Exod. xii. 16, 44; xx. 10; Deut. v. 14; xx. 16; Judg. xiii. 4; 2 Sam. xv. 11; Ps. xxxiii. 11; cxlii. 2; Ezek. xxxi 14 (Tob. iv. 7, 19; xii. 11). Quite as frequently, however, they use the good Greek *οὐ . . . οὐδείς (οὐδέν)*, Exod. x. 15; Deut. viii. 9; Josh. x. 8; Prov. vi. 35; xii. 21; or just the simple *οὐδείς*, Josh. xxiii. 9.

[2] If *Schleusner* means to prove from Cic. Rosc. Amer. 27 and ad famil. 2, 12 that *non omnis* is equivalent to *nullus*, he cannot have looked at these passages.

[3] That is, in the *Singular*; for in the Plural it is the current mode of expression in classic Greek also. Under this head comes the passage which, to explain the above Hebraism, *Weiske*, pleon. p. 58, has quoted from Plat. Phaed. 91 e. *πότερον, ἔφη, πάντας τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν λόγους οὐκ ἀποδέχεσθε, ἢ τοὺς μέν, τοὺς δ' οὔ; do you receive not* — i.e. *reject — all, or* do you receive *some and reject others?* How otherwise should this (with simplicity) have been expressed? In the Sept. cf. Num. xiv. 23; Josh. xi. 13; Ezek. xxxi. 14; Dan. xi. 37.

[4] When a writer attaches the negative to the verb at the beginning of his sentence (*οὐ δικαιωθήσεται*), he has already, in advance, the subject in his mind (*πᾶς*), and might therefore employ *οὐδείς*. But if he begins with *πᾶς*, either he has not decided whether to use an affirmative or a negative verb, or it seems to him more suitable to make a negative assertion in reference to *every one* (*πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων . . . οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται*) than an affirmative in reference to *no one*. The statement, *no believer* shall perish, assumes as it were an apprehension which the speaker means to obviate.

also in Greek authors; as, Dion. H. comp. 18 (V. 122) *μίαν οὐκ ἂν εὕροι τις σελίδα* etc., antiqq. II. 980, 10 *μία τε οὐ κατελείπετο* (according to Schaef.'s emendation), Plut. Gracch. 9, see Schaef. on this passage and on Dionys. compos. p. 247; Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. p. 121. From the Hebr. cf. Exod. x. 19; Isa. xxxiv. 16. This construction cannot be called either a Hellenism or a Hebraism; it is everywhere designed to give greater emphasis than resides in *οὐδείς*[1] (properly the same in signification, but weakened by usage).

Luke i. 37 *οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ θεῷ πᾶν ῥῆμα nothing, no thing* (cf. דָּבָר and in Greek *ἔπος*), is doubtless taken from Gen. xviii. 14 of the Sept. Matt. xv. 23 *οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον* is quite simple: *he answered her not a word* (there is no need of *ἕνα* here; just as we, too, do not emphasize the *a*).[2] The Greeks, too, could employ the same mode of expression; and its occurrence in 1 Kings xviii. 21 does not prove it to be a Hebraism.

2. *The one, the other* is expressed sometimes by *εἷς ... καὶ εἷς*,

a. In antithesis, Matt. xx. 21; xxiv. 40; xxvii. 38; xvii. 4; Mark x. 37; Jno. xx. 12; Gal. iv. 22 (but in Luke xvii. 34 *ὁ εἷς ... ὁ ἕτερος*, cf. xvi. 13; xviii. 10; Aesop. 119 de Fur.) (so in Heb. אֶחָד Exod. xvii. 12; Lev. xii. 8; xv. 15; 1 Sam. x. 3, etc.), for which Greek authors use *εἷς μέν, εἷς δέ* or *εἷς μέν, ὁ δέ*; see Fischer, ad Leusden. diall. p. 35; Mtth. 742. What Georgi, Vind. p. 159 sq., and Schwarz, Comment. p. 421, quote as parallel to the N. T. expression, are more properly enumerations, or calculations of a sum total, e.g. eight, one ... one ... one etc.

b. In reciprocal statements; as, 1 Thess. v. 11 *οἰκοδομεῖτε εἷς τὸν ἕνα*, 1 Cor. iv. 6. This is rather Aramaic (Hoffmann, Gramm. Syr. p. 330) — hence the Peschito also puts a double ܚܕ for *ἀλλήλ.* (Matt. xxiv. 10; Jno. xiii. 35) — though not at variance with Greek syntax, Her. 4, 50 *ἓν πρὸς ἓν συμβάλλειν*, Lucian. conscr. hist. 2 *ὡς οὖν ἕν, φασίν, ἑνὶ παραβαλεῖν*, asin. 54. Compare also the phrase *ἓν ἀνθ' ἑνός* (Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 339; Bhdy. Dionys. perieg. p. 853) and Kypke II. 339.

As *cuneus cuneum trudit*, some translate Matt. xii. 26 *ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει* the *one* Satan casts out the *other;* but note the Art. *ὁ ... τὸν*. On the other hand, cf. Luke xi. 17. 157 6th ed. 164 7th ed

The Heb. construction, *a man ... to his friend* or *brother*, is imitated by

[1] Hence likewise *οὐδὲ εἷς* are conjoined, *nemo quisquam, nemo unus* (Matt. xxvii. 14 *οὐδὲ ἓν ῥῆμα* ne unum quidem, Jno. i. 3; Rom. iii. 10; 1 Cor. vi. 5) *Hm.* Vig. 467; *Weber*, Dem. 501 (Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9; 4, 1, 14). In the Sept. this occurs frequently (particularly for לֹא אֶחָד), Exod. xiv. 28; Num. xxxi. 49. Cf. besides *οὐ ... ποτέ* 2 Pet. i. 21.

[2] Nor will any discriminating student think *ἕνα* necessary in the above passage because *εἷς* is elsewhere expressed (Matt. xxi. 24 *ἐρωτήσω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ λόγον ἕνα*).

187 the LXX. in Gen. xi. 3; xiii. 11; Judg. vi. 29; Ruth iii. 14; Jer. ix. 20 etc. but does not occur in the N. T.; cf. however, from Sept., Heb. viii. 11 *οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν πλησίον* (better *πολίτην*) *οὐτοῦ καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.*

As to the Hebraistic circumlocution for the pronoun *every* by the repetition of the noun, e.g. *ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ*, see § 54, 1, p. 463.

CHAPTER III.

THE NOUN.

§ 27. NUMBER AND GENDER OF NOUNS.

1. A Masculine noun in the Singular, with the Article, is often used collectively to denote the whole class; as, Jas. ii. 6 *ἠτιμάσατε τὸν πτωχόν* (Plur. in 1 Cor. xi. 22), v. 6; Rom. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 18; Matt. xii. 35. This construction is especially common with national names; as, *ὁ Ἰουδαῖος* Rom. iii. 1 (so *Romanus* for *Romani* frequently) Markland, Eurip. suppl. v. 659. The Singular in all such cases presents the distinctive characteristic more exclusively and more forcibly than the Plural,—designating, as the latter does, a multitude of individuals.

Similar to this construction is the use of the Singular to express, in reference to a plurality, an object which belongs to each of the individuals; as, 1 Cor. vi. 19 *ὅτι τὸ σῶμα ὑμῶν ναὸς τ. ἁγ. πνεύματος* (according to the best Codd.); Mark viii. 17 *πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν* (Jas. iii. 14; Luke i. 66; 2 Pet. ii. 14, etc.); Matt. xvii. 6 *ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν* (Luke ii. 31; 2 Cor. iii. 18; viii. 24);[1] Rev. vi. 11 *ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς στολὴ λευκή* (Luke xxiv. 4; Acts i. 10?); Eph. vi. 14 *περιζωσάμενοι τὴν ὀσφὺν ὑμῶν* etc. This distributive Singular, as it may be called, is fre-
188 quent in classic Greek; as, Xen. A. 4, 7, 16 *εἶχον κνημῖδας καὶ κράνη κ. μαχαίριον ... δόρυ* etc. Cyr. 4, 3, 11; Eurip. Cycl. 225; Thuc. 3, 22; 4, 4; 6, 58; Pol. 3, 49, 12; Ael. an. 5, 4; cf. Cic. Rab. 4, 11; Sen. ep. 87. In the Sept. cf. Gen. xlviii. 12; Lev. x. 6; Judg. xiii. 20; Lament. ii. 10; 1 Chron. xxix. 6; see also

[1] The phrases *ἀπὸ* or *πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν* or *ὑμῶν*, *κατὰ πρ. πάντων* etc. Luke ii. 31; Acts vii. 45; Exod. xxxiv. 11; Deut. iii. 18; vii. 19; viii. 20, etc., I should prefer, however, not to refer to this head, as they had already become adverbial.

testam. patr. p. 565.[1] In the N. T. the Plural is the usual con- 158
struction in this case (also Luke xxiv. 5; Acts i. 10). See in 6th ed.
general Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 264; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 158. 165
7th ed.

The collective use of the Singular is not to be extended beyond its natural bounds. In 1 Cor. vi. 5 *διακρῖναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ* does not stand for *τῆς ἀδελφότητος*; moreover, nothing would be gained in this way, since *ἀνὰ μέσον between* requires not a collective whole, but single individuals (the case is different in Matt. xiii. 25). It ought to have run *ἀνὰ μέσον ἀδελφοῦ καὶ ἀδελφοῦ* (Gen. xxiii. 15), or at least *τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ* (see Grotius), cf. Pol. 10, 48, 1; or the construction is a concise inaccuracy. Meyer's explanation takes for granted also an expression which is inaccurate as it is without example.

2. Conversely, the Plural of class (masc. or fem.) is used although the predicate refers primarily to only one individual, when the writer wishes to keep the thought somewhat vague; as, Matt. ii. 20 *τεθνήκασιν οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχὴν τοῦ παιδίου* (Herod the Great alone is meant, vs. 19), cf. Exod. iv. 19. See Aesch. Prom. 67; Eurip. Hec. 403; Aeschin. adv. Timarch. 21 and Bremi in loc. Porson, Eur. Phoen. p. 36; Reisig, Conject. in Aristoph. p. 58, and C. L. Roth, gramm. quaest. e C. Tacito. Norimb. 1829, 4to. § 1.

On the other hand, in Matt. ix. 8 *ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεὸν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*, the reference certainly is not to Christ alone, but the expression must be taken as actually universal, like Heb. ix. 23. In *οἱ λῃσταί* Matt. xxvii. 44 a different tradition from Luke xxiii. 39 must be recognized. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xv. 29 *ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν* cannot easily be referred to (the dead) Christ (for then it would have been *εἰς τοὺς νεκρούς*), but (unbaptized) dead men are meant.

The expression *τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* Acts xiii. 40; Jno. vi. 45 (*ἐν βιβλίῳ τῶν προφητῶν* Acts vii. 42) is a general form of quotation, like *in Paul's Epistles*, etc., employed when one does not wish, or is not able, to indicate the passage precisely. Essentially similar is Matt. xxiv. 26 189
ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, opposed to *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ*, cf. Liv. 1, 3 Silvius casu quodam in *silvis* natus.

In Matt. xxi. 7 *ἐπάνω αὐτῶν* probably refers to *ἱμάτια*. There would, however, be no intrinsic absurdity in referring it to the two animals, any more than the expression *ἐπιβεβηκὼς ἐπὶ ὄνον καὶ πῶλον*, verse 5, is absurd. We also say, loosely, *he sprang from the horses*, though only one of the team, the saddled horse, is meant.

[1] In 1 Thess. i. 7 *ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς τύπον πᾶσι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*, the Singular is used quite regularly, as Paul had in view the church as a *whole*. 1 Cor. x. 6, 11; 1 Pet. v. 3 are passages of a different kind, where the Singular would be surprising.

Quite erroneously has the Plural ἐπιστολαί in 1 Cor. xvi. 3 been taken for the Singular (Heumann in loc.). Though this Plural may be thus used of a single letter (Schaef. Plutarch. V. 446; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 132), yet here the words δι' ἐπιστολῶν are certainly to be joined to πέμψω; and the sending of several letters to different persons is in itself not at all unlikely.

166 7th ed. 159 6th ed. 3. Not a few nouns which are used by us ordinarily in the Singular, were employed exclusively, or at least predominantly, in the Plural; this is owing to the objects denoted by them having — from a general or from a Grecian or a Biblical point of view — some sensible or ideal manifoldness or comprehensiveness (Krü. 9f.); as, αἰῶνες Heb. i. 2 *world* (עוֹלָמִים), οὐρανοί *coeli* (Schneider, lat. Gr. II. 476) cf. 2 Cor. xii. 2, τὰ ἅγια *the sanctuary* Heb. viii. 2; ix. 8, 12, etc., ἀνατολαί, δυσμαί (*East, West*) Matt. viii. 11; xxiv. 27 (Plato, def. 411 b.; epin. 990 a.; D. S. 2, 43; Dio. C. 987, 32; Lucian. peregr. 39), τὰ δεξιά, ἀριστερά, εὐώνυμα, *the right, the left* (frequently), θύραι (*fores, folding-door*) Acts v. 19; Jno. xx. 19 (in Greek also πύλαι, but θύραι is a regular Plural in Acts xvi. 26f.; Matt. xxiv. 33), κόλποι *bosom* Luke xvi. 23 (22 Sing.) cf. Pausan. 6, 1, 2; Ael. 13, 31; also τὰ ἱμάτια of a (single) *upper-garment*, Jno. xix. 23; xiii. 4; Acts xviii. 6; the names of festivals ἐγκαίνια, γενέσια, ἄζυμα (Παναθήναια. *Saturnalia*, Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 20), also γάμοι *marriage* Matt. xxii. 2; Luke xii. 36 (cf. Tob. xi. 20); likewise ὀψώνια (Germ. Löhnung, soldier's pay) Rom. vi. 23 (Fr. Rom. I. 428), and ἀργύρια (*pieces of money, Shekel-pieces*) Matt. xxvi. 15; xxviii. 12.

When the names of countries or cities are Plural, this is due to their consisting (originally) of several provinces (as *Galliae*) or settlements; as, Ἀθῆναι, Πάταρα, Φίλιπποι, probably also τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα.[1]

Lastly, nouns denoting a feeling, disposition, or state, express in the Plural the modes or acts in which the feeling, etc. manifests itself; as, 1 Pet. ii. 1 ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν κακίαν ... κ. ὑποκρίσεις κ. φθόνους κ. πάσας καταλαλιάς, 2 Cor. xii. 20 ἔρις, ζῆλος, θυμοί, ἐριθεῖαι, καταλαλιαί, ψιθυρισμοί, φυσιώσεις, ἀκαταστασίαι, 2 Cor. xi. 23 ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις, Eph. vi. 190 11; Gal. v. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Jas. ii. 1 (2 Cor. ix. 6) Jude 13; 1 Cor. vii. 2; Fr. Rom. III. 6; Kritz, Sallust. I. 76. So οἰκτιρμοί, רַחֲמִים is more common than the Singular (only in Col. iii. 12 var.). Here belongs also Eph. ii. 3 θελήματα τῆς σαρκός. See, in general,

[1] Cf. *Nobbe*, schedae Ptolem. I. 22.

Jacobs, Act. philol. Monac. I. 154 sq.; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis p. 75 sq.; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 368; Heinichen, Euseb. III. 18 sq.; Bhdy. 62 f.

The Plural *αἵματα* Jno. i. 13 of blood as generative matter, has a direct parallel only in Eurip. Ion. 693 in the poetic language; but it is as easily accounted for in reference to a fluid as *τὰ ὕδατα* and *τὰ γάλακτα* Plat. legg. 10, 887 d. In Rev. xviii. 24 *αἵματα* is a real Plural, and accordingly does not come under the above rule; — a remark true also of *αἱ γραφαί, τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα, αἱ διαθῆκαι* Rom. ix. 4; Eph. ii. 12 (the covenants which God in patriarchal times repeatedly renewed with Abraham, Jacob, through Moses, cf. Wisd. xii. 21; 2 Macc. viii. 15). Similar is *ἐπαγγελίαι* in Heb. vii. 6. A Hebraistic *Plur. majest.* is not to be assumed in these words, nor in Jno. ix. 3; 2 Cor. xii. 1, 7 or Heb. ix. 23, where the statements are 167
general. *Τὰ σάββατα* when only the weekly day of rest is meant, Matt. 7th ed.
xii. 1; Luke iv. 16, etc., is either a transfer of the Aramaean form שַׁבָּתָא, or framed after the analogy of names of festivals. More easily might *ἅγια ἁγίων*, Heb. ix. 3, denoting *the most holy place* of the temple at Jerusalem, be pronounced a *Plur. excell.*, unless, with Erasmus and others, we prefer the accentuation *ἁγία ἁγίων* (cf. *δειλαία δειλαίων* Soph. El. 839). However, 160
though this portion of the Israelitish sanctuary is mentioned in the 6th ed.
Pentateuch under the designation *τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων* (Exod. xxvi. 33; Num. iv. 4), cf. Joseph. Antt. 3, 6, 4, yet in 1 Kings viii. 6 *the holy of holies* is actually called *τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων*. Cf. the Latin *penetralia, adyta* (Vir. Aen. 2, 297).

In reference to Phil. ii. 6 *τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ*, where *ἴσα* is used adverbially, compare the classic usage Iliad. 5, 71; Odyss. 1, 432; 15, 520; Soph. Oed. R. 1179; Thuc. 3, 14; Philostr. Ap. 8, 26, etc. See Reisig, Oed. Col. 526.

4. The Dual of nouns — except the numeral *δύο* — does not occur in the N. T., but in its stead only the Plural is used (with *δύο* in Matt. iv. 18; xviii. 9; xxvi. 37; Jno. iv. 40; Acts xii. 6, etc.); likewise in later Greek, generally, the dual-form is rare. Only in Rev. xii. 14 *τρέφεται καιρὸν καὶ καιρούς καὶ ἥμισυ καιροῦ* does the Plural of itself denote *two years;* this, however, is an imitation of the Chaldee עִדָּנִין Dan. vii. 25 in the Greek versions, and in this connection it may be remarked that the Chaldee regularly has no dual (my Chald. Grammat. S. 77). Accordingly the Plural, placed between *one* year and *half* a year, was allowably made to signify *two*. In later Greek, *χρόνος, χρόνοι*, came more and more to signify *year, years*. See also Evang. apoc. p. 60, 61; Epiphan. Mon. 29, 28.

Bornem. supposes he has found a trace of the Dual in Acts xv. 12 in 191
the reading *ἐξηγουμένω* (*ν* is added above the line) of *one* Cod. from which

Tdf. notes the reading ἐξηγούμενοι, and joyously hails the discovery of this number!

5. The Neuter, sing. or plur., is sometimes employed to denote a person, when the writer purposely expresses himself in general terms; as, 2 Thess. ii. 6 *τὸ κατέχον οἴδατε* (7 *ὁ κατέχων*), Heb. vii. 7 *τὸ ἔλαττον ὑπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος εὐλογεῖται* (Theodor. in loc.), [Matt. xviii. 11], Luke i. 35; 1 Cor. i. 27, 28 *τὰ μωρὰ τ. κόσμου ... τὰ ἀσθενῆ, τὰ ἐξουθενημένα* (26 *οἱ σοφοί*), Jno. vi. 37; 1 Jno. v. 4 cf. 1; (1 Cor. xi. 5, but not Col. i. 20; Heb. vii. 19; Jno. iii. 6; see the more recent expositors. In Rom. xi. 32 the established reading is *τοὺς πάντας*). Similarly, Thuc. 3, 11 *τὰ κράτιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑποδεεστέρους ξυνεπῆγον*, Xen. A. 7, 3, 11 *τὰ μὲν φεύγοντα καὶ ἀποδιδράσκοντα ἡμεῖς ἱκανοὶ ἐσόμεθα διώκειν καὶ μαστεύειν, ἢν δέ τις ἀνθίστηται* etc., Poppo, Thuc. I. 104; Seidler, Eurip. Troad. p. 61; Kritz, Sall. II. 69.

168 6. The Neuter seems to be employed for the Feminine in Mark
7th ed. xii. 28 *ποία ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη πάντων* (for *πασῶν*, which is a correction). But *πάντων* has no relation to the gender of the noun, but is equivalent to the general expression *omnium* (rerum); cf. Lucian. piscat. 13 *μία πάντων ἦγε ἀληθὴς φιλοσοφία* (according to the common reading; otherwise *πάντως*), Thuc. 4, 52 *τάς τε ἄλλας πόλεις καὶ πάντων μάλιστα τὴν Ἀνταν̓δρον*, see d'Orville, Charit. p. 549 sq.; Porson, Eur. Phoen. 121; Fr. Mr. l. c.

161 On the other hand, we cannot say with d'Orville (p. 292 sq.)
6th ed. that in Acts ix. 37, *λούσαντες αὐτὴν ἔθηκαν*, the masc. *λούσ.* is used for *λούσασαι* because the washing of corpses was the business of *women*. The writer expresses himself in the most general terms (Hm. Soph. Trachin. p. 39) and without reference to persons: *they washed and laid*. Had Luke intended to refer to that custom with historical precision, he would have employed more definite language. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 7, 2 *συνεληλύθασιν ... ἀδελφαί τε καὶ ἀδελφιδαὶ καὶ ἀνεψιαὶ τοσαῦται, ὥστ' εἶναι ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τεσσαρακαίδεκα τοὺς ἐλευθέρους the free* (free persons) *were fourteen*, where the Masculine is used though by the *free* (as it appears) females are to be understood. Suet. Ner. 33 acceptum a quadam Locusta, venenariorum inclita. (Luke xxii. 58, cf. Matt. xxvi. 71 — the accounts are different; see Mey.)

Neither is the Masculine used for the Feminine in the Sept. in Gen.
192 xxiii. 3 *ἀνέστη Ἀβραὰμ ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ αὐτοῦ ... 4 θάψω τὸν νεκρόν μου* (15), though Sarah is meant; nor in the History of Susann. 61 *ἐποίησαν αὐτοῖς ὃν τρόπον ἐπονηρεύσαντο τῷ πλησίον*, though the reference is to

Susanna. In the former case we Germans also say: *er begrub seinen Todten* (similarly in Soph. Antig. 830 φθιμένῳ — vulg. φθιμένᾳ — τοῖς ἰσοθέοις ἔγκληρα λαχεῖν μέγα), and in Greek *corpse* is always ὁ νεκρός, never in the Feminine; see, further, Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 114, 176.

Note 1. In Rom. xi. 4, containing a quotation from the Old Test. (1 Kings xix. 18), we find the Fem. ἡ Βάαλ (Hos. ii. 8; Zeph. i. 4), probably with no secondary contemptuous meaning as the feminine forms of names of false gods are said to be used in Arabic and Rabbinic (?), see Gesen. in Rosenm. Repertor. I. 139 and Tholuck in loc., and, on the other side, Fr. Rom. II. 442; but Paul, quoting from memory, might easily write ἡ Βάαλ as he had occasionally found it in the Sept. (yet at present the Codd. vary), though in this very passage the Sept. has τῷ Βάαλ. Rückert in loc. is in perplexity as often elsewhere. After all, it was matter of indifference whether the male or the female Baal was mentioned. Theile tries to explain by the usage of the Sept. μοιχαλίδες in the general address in Jas. iv. 4; but see, on the other hand, de Wette. The omission of the words μοιχοὶ καὶ has no decisive external authority in its favor; and it would be carrying deference to the (other) principal Codd. too far, to refuse to admit errors of transcription even when similar words come together.

Note 2. A noun of any gender, taken merely as a *word*, is joined, of course, to the Neuter Art.; as, Gal. iv. 25 τὸ Ἄγαρ, *the* (word) *Hagar*. 169
On the other hand, the Fem. should seem to be used for the Neut. in ἡ 7th ed.
οἰναί Rev. ix. 12; xi. 14; probably, however, some such word as θλῖψις or ταλαιπωρία floated before the mind of the writer.

Note 3. On the adverbial use of a Fem. Adjective, as ἰδίᾳ, κατ' ἰδίαν, etc., see § 54, 1, p. 463.

§ 28. THE CASES IN GENERAL. 162 6th ed.

1. Foreigners found no difficulty in comprehending in the general the respective import of the Greek cases (Hm. de emend. rat. I. 137 sqq.; Bhdy. S. 74 ff.).[1] And even the Jews were able to express in their language plainly enough the common relations 193
of case, although without the aid of terminations; the mode of denoting the Genitive in particular, approximated in Aramaic to that of the Occidental tongues. It remained, however, a matter of more difficulty to learn to catch the impressions made upon a Greek by the oblique cases in all their manifold and sometimes far-extended applications. Such a use of cases, moreover, did not

[1] A monograph on this subject is, *J. A. Hartung*, über die Casus, ihre Bildung und Bedeut. in der griech. u. lat. Sprache. Erlang. 1831, 8vo. (*Rumpel*, üb. die Casuslehre in Beziehung auf die griech. Sprache. Halle 1845, 8vo.)

accord with the graphic and explicit phraseology of Orientals; and we find, accordingly, that in the N. T., agreeably to the Eastern idiom and sometimes in direct imitation of it, prepositions are frequently employed where in classic Greek the simple cases would have sufficed even in prose; for instance, διδόναι ἐκ, ἐσθίειν ἀπό, μετέχειν ἐκ for διδόναι, ἐσθίειν, μετέχειν τινός (cf. § 30), πολεμεῖν μετά τινος for τινί, κατηγορεῖν and ἐγκαλεῖν κατά τινος (Luke xxiii. 14; Rom. viii. 33) for τινί,[1] ἐγείρειν τινὰ εἰς βασιλέα Acts xiii. 22 (§ 32), βασιλεύειν ἐπί τινι or τινά (עַל מָלַךְ) for τινός, ἀθῶος ἀπό τ. for the Genitive alone (Krebs, obs. e Josepho p. 73 sq.). [Hither may be referred also without hesitation μνεῖσθαι ἐν τ. Phil. iv. 12 for τινί; see Wiesinger in loc.] From the Sept. cf. φείδεσθαι ἐπί τινι or τινος or ὑπέρ τινος (חוּס עַל).

This use of prepositions with cases instead of cases alone, is, however, in general characteristic of (antique) simplicity, and occurs therefore in Greek, not only in the earlier poets, as Homer, but in prose writers also, as
170 Lucian; see Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 11 sq. Hence even from good writers
7th ed. many instances of the kind may be quoted, such as παύειν ἀπό, cf. Mtth. 833.

2. No case is ever in reality put for another (*enallage casuum*). Sometimes, however, two cases can be used with equal correctness in one and the same connection when the relation to be expressed may be viewed in two different ways; for example Ἀσσύριος τῷ γένει and τὸ γένος, προσκυνεῖν τινι *to show reverence to one*, and προσκυνεῖν τινα *to revere one*, καλῶς ποιεῖν τινα and τινι (Thilo, Act. Thom. 38), ἔνοχός τινι and τινος (Fr. Mt. p. 223),[2] ὅμοιός τινος and τινι, πληροῦσθαί τινος (made full *of* something) and τινι (filled *with* something). Also μιμνήσκεσθαί τι and τινος (like *recordari rei* and *rem*); in the former case (with the Acc.)
163 I conceive of the remembering as directed (transitively) to the
6th ed. object; with the Gen. (*meminisse rei*) the remembrance is conceived of as emanating or coming from the object. It cannot be said, therefore, that in any instance the Dat. or Acc. is put for the Gen., or *vice versa;* but both cases, logically, are alike correct, and it only remains to notice which construction has become the more usual, or whether one of them belongs especially to the later
194 language or to any particular writer (as εὐαγγελίζεσθαί τινα, προσκυνεῖν τινι).

[1] As the Byzantines sometimes say: ἀγανακτεῖν or ὀργίζεσθαι κατά τινος, or Dio Chr. 38, 470 ὀργίζεσθαι πρός τινα.

[2] The distinction which *Schaef.* Demosth. V. 323, lays down between these two constructions is not confirmed by the N. T. Cf. besides, *Mtth.* 850.

Perhaps the most absurd instance of *enallage casuum* that could be alleged, would be 2 Cor. vi. 4 συνιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι for διακόνους. Both expressions, indeed, can be used, but in different significations. *I commend myself as instructor* (Nom.) means: in the office of an instructor which I have undertaken; but *I commend myself as an instructor* (Acc.) means: as one who wishes or is able to be an instructor.

3. Every case, as such, stands in a necessary connection, according to its nature, with the structure of the sentence in which it occurs. This connection is most direct as regards the Nom. and Acc., the former as the case of the subject, the latter as that of the object; — for secondary relations, the Gen. and Dat. There are also, however, casus *absoluti* i.e. cases which are not wrought into the grammatical structure of the sentence, — cases which are grammatically isolated, and have only a logical connection with the sentence. Nominatives absolute are the most frequent and the most distinctly marked (Bengel on Matt. xii. 36). Real Accusatives absolute are more rare (§ 63. I. 2 d.), cf. Fr. Rom. III. 11 sq., for what is called an Accusative absolute is often dependent, though loosely, on the construction of the sentence. As to Genitives and Datives absolute, the import of these cases proves them to be regular component parts of the sentence. See, in general, A. de Wannowski, syntaxeos anomalae graecae pars de constructione, quae dicitur, absoluta, etc. Lips. 1835, 8vo.; F. W. Hoffmann, 171
observata et monita de casibus absol. ap. Graecos et Lat. ita positis 7th ed.
ut videantur non posse locum habere. Budiss. 1836, 4to. (it treats only of the Gen. and Dat. absolute); J. Geisler, de graecor. nominativis absol. Vratisl. 1845, 8vo., and E. Wentzel, de genitivis et dat. absol. Vratisl. 1828, 8vo. But the whole subject of the Nominative absolute comes under the head of Structure of Sentences.

§ 29. NOMINATIVE AND VOCATIVE.

1. A noun considered simply and solely in itself is represented by the Nominative; and is either subject or predicate in a sentence, according to the latter's structure; as, Jno. i. 1 ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος, Eph. ii. 14 αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν.

Sometimes, however, a Nominative, without being wrought into 164
the structure of the sentence to which it belongs, is either placed 6th ed.
at its head as a sort of title or topic (Nom. absol.), or inserted as 195
a term of designation (Nom. tituli) as if it were an indeclinable

word: a. Acts vii. 40 *ὁ Μωϋσῆς οὗτος . . . οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί γέγονεν αὐτῷ*, see § 28, 3. b. Jno. xviii. 10 *ἦν ὄνομα τῷ δούλῳ Μάλχος*, Rev. vi. 8; viii. 11; xix. 13 (Demosth. Macart. 669 b.), Luke xix. 29 *πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιών*,[1] Cf. 1 Sam. ix. 9 *τὸν προφήτην ἐκάλει ὁ λαὸς ἔμπροσθεν ὁ βλέπων*, Malal. 18, 482; 10, 247 see Lob. Phryn. 517.[2] But Acts i. 12 *ἀπὸ ὄρους τοῦ καλουμένου Ἐλαιῶνος*.

Usually, however, names, where an oblique case is necessary, take that case, and so are construed as part of the sentence (and *ὀνόματι* merely interposed); as, Acts xxvii. 1 *ἑκατοντάρχῃ ὀνόματι Ἰουλίῳ*, ix. 11, 12 *ἄνδρα Ἀνανίαν ὀνόματι εἰσελθόντα* (xviii. 2; Matt. xxvii. 32; Luke v. 27), xviii. 7 *οἰκία τινὸς ὀνόματι Ἰούστου*, also Matt. i. 21, 25 *καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν*, Luke i. 13 (as an apposition to *ὄνομα*), even Mark iii. 16 *ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρον*. (Different modes of expression are combined in Plut. Coriol. 11.)

172 2th ed. In Rev. i. 4 the Nom. *ὁ ὢν κ. ὁ ἦν κ. ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (יְהוָה *the Immutable*) is designedly used as indeclinable. See § 10. p. 68.

2. Coincident with a. above is the use of the Nom. (with the Article) in addressing, particularly in calling or commanding; consequently, instead of the Vocative, which was intended for this purpose (Fischer-Weller III. 1. 319 sq.; Markland, Eurip. Iph. Aul. 446). This use of the Nom. sometimes occurs, also, in the N. T., as Matt. xi. 26 *ναὶ, ὁ πατὴρ* (*ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι* 25), *ὅτι οὕτως ἐγένετο*, Heb. i. 8; x. 7 (in the Sept. cf. Ps. xlii. 2; xxii. 2), especially in the Imperat., as Luke viii. 54 *ἡ παῖς ἔγειρε*, Matt. xxvii. 29 *χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τ. Ἰουδ.* Jno. xix. 3; Mark v. 41; ix. 25; Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 18; Rev. vi. 10. This form of expression may have originally possessed some degree of roughness or harshness (Bhdy. 67), and retains it even in Greek prose. Afterwards, however, it was employed without special emphasis, and also in the kindest ad-

[1] In all earlier editions (including that of *Lchm.*) we find *ἐλαιῶν*. I am not prepared, with *Fr.*, to pronounce this accent positively wrong. Luke, intending his Gospel for foreign readers, in mentioning for the first time the Mount of Olives, well enough known in Palestine, might naturally say, *the so-called Mount of Olives*, as in Acts i. 12. But the expression *πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ λεγόμενον ἐλαιῶν* would have to be resolved into *τὸ λεγόμενον ὄρος ἐλαιῶν ad montem qui dicitur olivarum;* and the Article before *ἐλ.* would be by no means necessary. Perhaps even the Syriac translator read *Ἐλαιών;* he renders the above as he does Acts i. 12: ܛܘܪܐ ܕܙܝܬܐ but *ὄρος τῶν ἐλ.* Matt. xxi. 1, simply ܛܘܪܐ xxiv. 3 etc.

[2] We find even *τὴν ἀνθρωποτόκος φωνήν* Theodoret. IV. 1304, *τὴν θεὸς προσηγορίαν* III. 241; IV. 454, where the Romans (a circumstance which modern writers of Latin generally overlook) always employ the Genitive.

dresses, as in Luke xii. 32 *μὴ φοβοῦ, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον*, viii. 54 (Bar. 4, 5), even in prayers, as in Luke xviii. 11; Heb. x. 7.

On the other hand, Jno. xx. 28, though directed to Jesus (*εἶπεν αὐτῷ*), is rather exclamation than address; and, in the Greek authors, such a Nom. has early and strong prominence (Bhdy. as above, Krü. 12). So also Luke xii. 20 (according to the reading *ἄφρων*, and 1 Cor. xv. 36, where *ἄφρον* has little authority in its favor), likewise Phil. iii. 18, 19 *πολλοὶ γὰρ περιπατοῦσιν, οὓς πολλάκις ἔλεγον ... τοὺς ἐχθροὺς τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῦ Χρ., ὧν τὸ τέλος ἀπώλεια ... οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρονοῦντες*, perhaps also Mark xii. 38–40 *βλέπετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων, τῶν θελόντων ... καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς ... καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ... οἱ κατεσθίοντες τὰς οἰκίας ... οὗτοι λήψονται περισσότερον κρῖμα* (yet here the words *οἱ κατεσθ.* may also be joined with *οὗτοι λήψονται*).[1] — Vocative and Nominative are united in Rev. xviii. 20. 196 165 6th ed

3. In the N. T., however, the Vocative, with or more frequently without *ὦ*, is far more common than the Nom. in addresses. We find *ὦ* only in addresses, Acts i. 1; xxvii. 21; xviii. 14; 1 Tim. vi. 11, mostly of adjuration and censure (Lob. Soph. Aj. 451 sq., see Fritzsche, Aristoph. I. 4), Rom. ii. 1, 3; ix. 20; 1 Tim. vi. 20; Jas. ii. 20; Gal. iii. 1, or in exclamations, as Luke xxiv. 25; Acts xiii. 10. On the other hand, in mere accosting or calling the Vocative without *ὦ* is employed, as Luke xiii. 12; xxii. 57; xxiii. 28; Matt. ix. 22; Jno. iv. 21; xix. 26; Acts xiii. 15; xxvii. 25. Even at the beginning of a speech, where *ὦ* is regularly prefixed by the Greeks, we find in the N. T. for the most part the Vocative alone: Acts i. 16; ii. 14; iii. 12; xiii. 16; xv. 13 (see, however, Franke, Demosth. p. 193).[2]

An adjective belonging to a Vocative is put in the Voc. also; as, Jas. ii. 20 *ὦ ἄνθρωπε κενέ*, Matt. xviii. 32; Jno. xvii. 11 (but cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 466); on apposition with the Vocative, however, see § 59, 8. 173 7th ed

Note. Some have erroneously attributed to the language of the N. T. a Hebraistic circumlocution for the Nominative,

a. by means of the Acc. with *εἰς*, in the phrases *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι εἴς τι*, (Leusden, diall. p. 132). By far the greater number of the passages adduced are quotations from the Old Test. or expressions taken from it that have become standing phrases (Matt. xix. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 16; Eph. v. 31;

[1] *Hm.* praef. ad Eur. Androm. p. 15 sq. says, mihi quidem ubique nominativus, quem pro vocativo positum volunt, non vocantis sed declarantis esse videtur: o tu, qui es talis. This applies to some of the above passages but not to all, and ought probably to be asserted primarily only of the poets.

[2] On *ὦ* before the Vocative, see, in general, *Doberenz*, Progr. Hildburgh. 1844, 4to.

Heb. viii. 10, etc.). Besides, it was overlooked that the expression
197 γίνεσθαι εἰς τι *fieri* i.e. *abire* (*mutari*) *in aliq.* (Acts v. 36; Jno. xvi. 20; Rev. viii. 11) may be used in Greek (Georgi, Vind. 337; Schwarz, Comment. 285), and is used, by the later authors at least, even in reference to persons (Geo. Pachymer. I. 345 εἰς συμμάχους αὐτοῖς γίνονται); further, it was not considered that in the Hebrew expression equivalent to εἶναι εἴς τι, the ל does not properly express the Nom. but corresponds to our (*turn* or *serve*) *to* or *for something*, (Heb. viii. 10; 1 Cor. xiv. 22, cf. Wisd. ii. 14; Acta apocr. 169). In 1 Cor. iv. 3 ἐμοὶ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν signifies, *to me* (for me) *it belongs to what is of least importance, most insignificant* (I rank it as such). Εἰς οὐδὲν λογισθῆναι Acts xix. 27 is similar: to be accounted *as*
166 *nothing* (Wisd. ix. 6).[1] In Luke ii. 34 κεῖται εἰς πτῶσιν the preposition
4th ed. indicates in like manner the *destination*, and does not conflict with Greek analogy, see Phil. i. 17 (16); 1 Thess. iii. 3, cf. Aesop. 24, 2 εἰς μείζονά σοι ὠφέλειαν ἐσομαι, and the Latin *auxilio esse* (Zumpt, Gr. S. 549). See, further, § 32. 4. b. p. 228.

b. by means of ἐν as an imitation of the Hebrew *Beth essentiae* (Gesen. Lgb. 838; Knobel on Isa. xxviii. 16), in the passages Mark v. 25 γυνή τις οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος, Rev. i. 10 ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Glass. I. 31), Eph. v. 9 ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ φωτὸς ἐν πάσῃ ἀγαθωσύνῃ (Hartmann, linguist. Einl 384), and Jno. ix. 30 ἐν τούτῳ θαυμαστόν ἐστι (Schleusner, under ἐν). But, in the first passage, εἶναι ἐν ῥ. is *to be in the state of*, etc. In the second, γίνεσθαι ἐν πνεύματι ἐν is *to be present anywhere in spirit*. In the third, εἶναι ἐν is equivalent to *contineri, positum esse in* (see the expositors). The last passage may be aptly rendered: *herein is a marvellous thing*. Gesenius too has attributed this Hebraistic construction to Greek and Latin writers unwarrantably; for εἶναι ἐν σοφοῖς, *in magnis viris* (*habendum*) *esse*, assuredly contains nothing anomalous, but is quite a natural combination, and is to be rendered, *belong to the number of*. Ἐν and *in* would be equivalent to a *Beth essentiae* only in case the expression were: ἐν σοφῷ, *in sapienti viro*, for σοφός, *sapiens*. But no reasonable man can talk so, and in a word the Hebraistic *Beth essentiae* construction
174 is a pure figment of empirical grammarians;[2] see my edition of Simonis
7th ed. p. 109, and Fr. Mr. p. 291 sq. The other examples adduced by Haab (S. 337 f.) are so manifestly inadmissible that we will not tarry a moment upon them.

198 § 30. GENITIVE.

1. The Genitive is acknowledged to be the *whence*-case — (the case denoting source, departure, or descent; cf. Hartung, Casus

[1] Quite different the expression χρήματα εἰς ἀργύριον λογίζεσθαι Xen. C. 3, 1, 33.

[2] With the entirely misunderstood בָּרָא הוּא, Exod. xxxii. 22, compare Ael. 10, 11 ἀποθανεῖν ἐν καλῷ ἐστιν. Should this too be taken for καλόν ἐστιν?

S. 12), and is most clearly recognized as such in connection with words expressive of action, and accordingly, with verbs. Its most common and most familiar appearance in prose, however, is in connecting two substantives; here, through its gradually extended signification, it denotes every sort of *dependence* or *belonging*;[1] e.g. *ὁ κύριος τοῦ κόσμου, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου.*

We shall consider first this use of the Genitive — (in connection with which even a Pronoun or the Article cf. § 18, 3 may hold the place of the governing word). And since even this comprehends, 167
in plain prose alone, a great diversity of significations (Schaef. 6th ed.
Eurip. Or. 48) exclusive of the common instances, — to which belong particularly the Gen. of quality, Rom. xv. 5, 13 etc., and the partitive Genitive, Rom. xvi. 5; 1 Cor. xvi. 15, — we notice,

a. The Genitive of the Object after substantives which denote an internal or an external operation — a feeling, judgment, action (Krü. 30 f.); as, Matt. xiii. 18 *παραβολὴ τοῦ σπείροντος parable of* i.e. concerning *the sower*, 1 Cor. i. 6 *μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ testimony* concerning *Christ* (ii. 1 cf. xv. 15), viii. 7 *ἡ συνείδησις τοῦ εἰδώλου consciousness about the idol*, i. 18 *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ*, Matt. xxiv. 6 *ἀκοαὶ πολέμων rumors of wars* (concerning *wars*), cf. Mtth. 814; Acts iv. 9 *εὐεργεσία ἀνθρώπου towards* (conferred on) *a man* (Thuc. 1, 129; 7, 57; Plat. legg. 8, 850 b.), Jno. vii. 13; xx. 19 *φόβος Ἰουδαίων* fear *in reference to* the Jews (Eurip. Andr. 1059), xvii. 2 *ἐξουσία πάσης σαρκός* power *over* (Matt. x. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 12), 2 Pet. ii. 13, 15 *μισθὸς ἀδικίας* wages *for* unrighteousness, Rom. x. 2 *ζῆλος θεοῦ* zeal *for* God (Jno. ii. 17; 1 Macc. ii. 58; otherwise 2 Cor. xi. 2), Heb. ix. 15 *ἀπολύτρωσις τῶν παραβάσεων* redemption *from* (Plato, rep. 1. 329 c.). Compare likewise Matt. xiv. 1 (Joseph. antt. 8, 6, 5) Luke vi. 12 (Eurip. Troad. 895) Eph. ii. 20; Rom. xv. 8; 2 Pet. i. 9; Jas. ii. 4; 1 Cor. xv. 15; Heb. x. 24. For examples from Greek authors, see Markland, Eur. suppl. 199
838; d'Orville, Char. p. 498; Schaef. Soph. II. 201; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 201, and Apol. p. 29; Poppo, III. I. 521.

The following phrases are of frequent recurrence in the N. T.: 175
ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ or *Χριστοῦ* love *to* God, *to* Christ, Jno. v. 42; 1 Jno. 7th ed.
ii. 5, 15; iii. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 5 (but not Rom. v. 5; viii. 35; 2 Cor. v. 14; Eph. iii. 19), *φόβος θεοῦ* or *κυρίου* Acts ix. 31; Rom. iii. 18;

[1] If the Genitive is viewed not so much as respects its origin as abstractly, its nature may be defined as follows (*Hm.* Opusc. I. 175 and Vig. p. 877): Genitivi proprium est id indicare, cujus quid aliquo quocumque modo accidens est. Cf. de emendanda rat. p. 139. Similarly *Mdv.* 49. See, moreover, *Schneider* on Caesar, Bell. Gall. 1, 21, 2.

2 Cor. v. 11; vii. 1; Eph. v. 21, *πίστις τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ* or *Ἰησοῦ* Mark xi. 22; Rom. iii. 22; Gal. ii. 16; iii. 22; Eph. iii. 12; Phil. iii. 9; Jas. ii. 1; Rev. xiv. 12 (*πίστις ἀληθείας* 2 Thess. ii. 13), *ὑπακοὴ τοῦ Χριστοῦ* or *τ. πίστεως* etc. 2 Cor. x. 5; Rom. i. 5; xvi. 26; 1 Pet. i. 22 (2 Cor. ix. 13). But *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, in the doctrinal phraseology of Paul (Rom. i. 17; iii. 21 f; x. 3 etc.) is,—agreeably to his teaching concerning *θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν* (cf. iii. 30; iv. 5),—righteousness *which God bestows* (on man), and, the meaning once fixed, *δικαιοσ. θεοῦ* might be predicated even of believers themselves, 2 Cor. v. 21. Others, with Luther, understand the expression thus: the righteousness that avails before God (quae deo satisfacit, Fr. Rom. I. 47), *δικ. παρὰ τῷ θεῷ*. The possibility of this explanation lies in *δίκαιος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* Rom. ii. 13 antithetic to *δικαιοῦσθαι*, and still more immediately in *δικαιοῦσθαι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ* Gal. iii. 11, or *ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ* Rom. iii. 20. Both expressions would be appropriate according to the nature of the *δικαιοῦσθαι* in question. But the interpretation *δικαιοῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον* is the more rigorous, and in Rom. x. 3 a better antithesis is gained if *δικ. θεοῦ* denotes *righteousness which God imparts*. Compare also Phil. iii. 9 *ἡ ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνη*.

168 6th ed. It is obvious from the preceding considerations that the decision between the Subjective and the Objective Genitive rests in many passages not with the grammarian but with the exegete, and the latter in making it must give careful attention to parallel passages also.

In Phil. iv. 7 *εἰρήνη θεοῦ* can only mean *the peace* (of soul) *that God gives*, according to the custom of the apostles to wish their readers *εἰρήνην ἀπὸ θεοῦ*; and *this* parallelism is more decisive here than Rom. v. 1 *εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν* (according to which peace *with* God must be the translation). Likewise in Col. iii. 15 *εἰρήνη Χριστοῦ* I take the Genitive to be Subjective, cf. Jno. xiv. 27. That *δικαιοσύνη πίστεως* (a *single* notion: *faith-righteousness*), Rom. iv. 13, signifies *righteousness* which *faith* brings with it, is manifest from the more frequent expression *ἡ δικ. ἡ ἐκ πίστεως* Rom. ix. 30; x. 6. In Eph. iv. 18 *ἀπηλλοτριωμένοι τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ θεοῦ* is *God's-life*; the life of Christian believers is so called as being a life communicated, inwardly excited, by God.

200 Whether the Genitive in the phrase *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ* is to be taken as Subjective (the Gospel made known by Christ), or Objective (the Gospel concerning Christ), may be doubted. For my part I prefer the latter, because in some passages we find the entire expression *εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ* (e.g. Rom. i. 3), of which the other is probably but an abridgment; cf. also *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ* Acts xx. 24, and *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ* Matt. iv. 23; ix. 35. Mey. (on

Mark i. 1) declares himself now for one view, now for the other. Likewise in Col. ii. 18 expositors are not agreed whether in θρησκεία ἀγγέλων the 176
Gen. is to be taken as Subjective or as Objective; the latter is preferable: 7th ed.
worship paid to angels, angel-worship; cf. Euseb. H. E. 6, 41 θρησκεία τῶν δαιμόνων (var.), Philo II. 259 θρ. θεῶν (ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ λατρεία Plat. Apol. 23 c.). In 1 Tim. iv. 1 δαιμονίων is undoubtedly a Subjective Genitive. But in βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς, Heb. vi. 2, if the latter be considered as the principal noun (see below, 3. note 4), βαπτισμ. can only denote the object of the διδαχή. In Rom. viii. 23 ἀπολύτρωσις τοῦ σώματος, according to Paul's teaching, appears rather to signify *liberation of the body* (from that δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς 21) than *liberation from the body*. Likewise in Heb. i. 3; 2 Pet. i. 9 καθαρισμὸς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν might mean *purification of sins* (removal of sins, cf. Deut. xix. 13), just as one may say καθαρίζονται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι (cf. καθαίρειν αἷμα to remove by purification, Iliad 16, 667); but it is simpler to take τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν as an Objective Genitive. In Rom. ii. 7 ὑπομονὴ ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ, 1 Thess. i. 3 ὑπομονὴ τῆς ἐλπίδος, is simply: *steadfastness of well-doing, steadfastness of hope*. Jas. ii. 4 is probably an indignant question: *would ye not in this become judges of evil thoughts* (your own)?

2. But the Genitive is likewise employed, b. to denote relations of dependence still more remote (cf. Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 108 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Tim. p. 241 sq.; Bhdy. 160 ff.). In this way, by a kind of condensed expression, compound designations are formed which must be resolved variously, according to the relation of the ideas composing them. We distinguish,

a. The Genitive which expresses relations entirely *external* (of 169
place or of time); as, Matt. x. 5 ὁδὸς ἐθνῶν *the way to the gentiles* 6th ed.
(Heb. ix. 8 cf. Gen. iii. 24. ἡ ὁδὸς τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, Jer. ii. 18; Judith v. 14)[1], Jno. x. 7 θύρα τῶν προβάτων *door to the sheep* (Mey.), Matt. i. 11, 12 μετοικεσία Βαβυλῶνος the *carrying away to Babylon* (Orph. 200 ἐπὶ πλόον Ἀξείνοιο *ad expeditionem in Axinum*, 144 νόστος οἶκοιο *domum reditus*, Eurip. Iph. T. 1066 cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 90; Seidler, Eurip. Electr. 161; Spohn, Isocr. Paneg. p. 2; Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 67),[2] Jno. vii. 35 ἡ διασπορὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων *the dispersion* (the dispersed) *among the Greeks*, Mark viii. 27 κῶμαι Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου *towns about Caesarea Ph.*, situated on its territory (Isa. xvii. 2),[3] Col. i. 20 αἷμα τοῦ σταυροῦ *blood of the* 201

[1] But Matt. iv. 15 ὁδὸς θαλάσσης undoubtedly *way by the sea* (of Tiberias).

[2] *Vice versa* Plat. Apol. 40 c. μετοίκησις τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἐνθένδε (away from this place).

[3] This finally comes back to the common topographical (*Krü.* 27) Genitive, as Jno. ii. 1 Κανᾶ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, Acts xxii. 3 Ταρσὸς τῆς Κιλικίας, xiii. 13 f.; xxvii. 5; Luke iv. 26; cf. Xen. H. 1, 2, 12; D. S. 16, 92; 17, 63; Diog. L. 8, 3; Arrian. Al. 2, 4, 1, see *Ellendt*, Arrian. Al. I. 151; *Ramshorn*, lat. Gr. I. 167 — and this is simply the Genitive of belonging.

cross i.e. *blood* shed *on the cross*, 1 Pet. i. 2 *ῥαντισμὸς αἵματος sprinkling* (purifying) *with blood*, 2 Cor. xi. 26 *κίνδυνοι ποταμῶν*
177 *dangers on rivers* (followed immediately by *κίνδ. ἐν πόλει, ἐν θα-*
7th ed. *λάσσῃ* etc.), cf. Heliod. 2, 4, 65 *κίνδυνοι θαλασσῶν*.

Designations of time: Rom. ii. 5 (Zeph. ii. 2) *ἡμέρα ὀργῆς day of wrath*, that is, day on which the punitive wrath of God will be manifested, Jude 6 *κρίσις μεγάλης ἡμέρας judgment* (at) *on the great day*, Luke ii. 44 *ὁδὸς ἡμέρας a day's journey* (distance travelled in a day, cf. Her. 4, 101; Ptol. 1, 11, 4), Heb. vi. 1 *ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγος primary Christian instruction*. So also *τεκμήρια ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα* Acts i. 3 according to D.[1]

An external (local) relation also is expressed in *ἀλάβαστρον μύρου* Mark xiv. 3 and *κεράμιον ὕδατος* verse 13, cf. 1 Sam. x. 3 *ἀγγεῖα ἄρτων, ἀσκὸς οἴνου*, Soph. El. 758 *χαλκὸς σποδοῦ* (see Schaef. Longi Pastor. p. 386), Dion. H. IV. 2028 *ἀσφάλτου καὶ πίσσης ἀγγεῖα*, Theoph. Ch. 17; Diog. L. 6, 9; 7, 3; Lucian. asin. 37; fugit. 31; Diod. S. Vatic. 32, 1. Under this head also comes Jno. xxi. 8 *τὸ δίκτυον τῶν ἰχθύων* (11 *μεστὸν ἰχθύων*), even *ἀγέλη χοίρων* Matt. viii. 30 and *ἑκατὸν βάτοι ἐλαίου* Luke xvi. 6. See on this Genitive of contents, Krü. 32.

Ἀνάστασις *νεκρῶν* is nowhere in the N. T. equivalent to *ἀνάστασις ἐκ νεκρῶν*, but denotes even in Rom. i. 4 *the resurrection of the dead*, absolutely and generically, although consummated only in a single individual. The doctrinal remarks of Philippi on this expression are mere trifling.

β. The more remote *internal* relations are especially expressed by the Genitive in the writings of John and Paul; as, Jno. v. 29
170 *ἀνάστασις ζωῆς, κρίσεως, resurrection to life, resurrection to judg-*
6th ed *ment* (Genitive of destination, Theodor. IV. 1140 *ἱερωσύνης χειροτονία to the priesthood*, cf. Rom. viii. 36 Sept. *πρόβατα σφαγῆς*), Rom. v. 18 *δικαίωσις ζωῆς justification to life*, Mark i. 4 *βάπτισμα μετανοίας baptism engaging to repentance*, Rom. vii. 2 *νόμος τοῦ ἀνδρός law of the husband*, i.e. which lays down the relation to the husband (cf. Dem. Mid. 390 a. *ὁ τῆς βλάβης νόμος the law of damage*, frequently in the Sept. as in Lev. xiv. 2 *ὁ νόμος τοῦ λεπροῦ*, vii. 1;
202 xv. 32; Num. vi. 13, 21, see Fr. Rom. II. 9), vi. 6 *σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας body of sin*, i.e body which belongs to sin, in which sin has tenancy and lordship (in which sin is carried into effect), very like *σῶμα τῆς σαρκός* Col. i. 22 body in which carnality permanently dwells:

[1] Others, with less probability, take *ἡμερῶν τεσσαρ.* by itself: *during forty days* (*Jacobs*, Achill. Tat. p. 640 sq.); yet see below, No. 11, p. 207.

Rom. vii. 24 *σῶμα τοῦ θανάτου τούτου body of this death*, i.e. which (in the way described vs. 7 sqq.) leads to death, vss. 5, 10, and 13. See, further, Tit. iii. 5.

In Luke xi. 29 *τὸ σημεῖον* Ἰωνᾶ is simply *the sign once exhibited in Jonah* (now to be repeated in the person of Christ). In the same way must Jude 11 be explained; but in Jno. xix. 14 *παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα* does not mean the day of preparation *for* the Passover, but simply and naturally 178
the resting-day of the Passover (the day of rest belonging to the Paschal 7th ed.
festival). In Heb. iii. 13 *ἀπάτη τῆς ἁμαρτίας* is the Subjective Genitive, and *ἁμαρτία* is to be taken as a personification (Rom. vii. 11 etc.). Yet in 2 Thess. ii. 10 *ἀπάτη τῆς ἀδικίας* is, *deceit leading to unrighteousness*. On Eph. iv. 18 see Mey., and on Jas. i. 17 de Wette. Further, in Eph. iii. 1; 2 Tim. i. 8, Philem. 1, 9 *δέσμιος Χριστοῦ a prisoner of Christ* means one whom Christ (the cause of Christ) has made and keeps a prisoner,[1] cf. Wisd. xvii. 2; in Jas. ii. 5 *οἱ πτωχοὶ τοῦ κόσμου* (if the reading is correct) *the poor of the world* signifies, they who in their position in the world are poor, poor therefore in worldly goods (though *κόσμος* itself does not on this account mean worldly goods). In Jno. vi. 45 *διδακτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ instructed of God*, that is by God, as in Matt. xxv. 34 *οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ πατρός* means *blessed by the Father*. In Eph. vi. 4, 11, 13 *κυρίου* and *θεοῦ* are genitivi auctoris, as also *τῶν γραφῶν* Rom. xv. 4. Likewise Phil. i. 8 *ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ* Ἰ. is to be taken as the Subjective Genitive, though the more precise interpretation may be various. Cf. also Eph. vi. 4 and 171
Mey. Lastly, the correct interpretation of 1 Pet. iii. 21 does not depend 6th ed.
so much on the Genitive *συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς* as on the meaning of *ἐπερώτημα*; *sponsio* would accord perfectly with the context, but this rendering has not been lexically established either by de Wette or Huther. On Heb. ix. 11 see Bleek. In 1 Cor. i. 27 *τοῦ κόσμου* is the Subjective Genitive; see Meyer. In 1 Cor. x. 16 *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας* means simply *the cup of blessing*, that is, over which the blessing is uttered; and in 21 *ποτ. κυρίου* 203
means *cup of the Lord*, where the closer relation of the Genitive is to be gathered from 16, just as in Col. ii. 11 that of *Χριστοῦ* is to be deduced from 14. Mey. gives a correct decision on Col. i. 14. In Acts xxii. 3 *νόμου* depends on *κ. ἀκρίβειαν*.

[1] As in Philem. 13 *δεσμοὶ τοῦ εὐαγγ.* means bonds which the Gospel has brought. Without reference to the parallel passages the above might be rendered: *a prisoner belonging to Christ*. Others translate it, *a prisoner for Christ's sake*. In the N. T the Genitive is frequently so explained (Mtth. 851; Krü. 31), yet always incorrectly. Heb. xiii. 13 *τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν Χριστοῦ φέροντες* is: *bearing the reproach which Christ bore* (and still bears). So also 2 Cor. i. 5 *περισσεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἡμᾶς the sufferings which Christ had to endure*, i.e. from the enemies of divine truth, *come* (anew) *abundantly upon us*; for, the sufferings which believers endure (for the sake of divine truth) are essentially one with the sufferings of Christ, — only a continuation of them (cf. Phil. iii. 10). So also probably Col. i. 24 *αἱ θλίψεις τοῦ Χριστοῦ* and 2 Cor. iv. 10. On the first passage, which has been very variously explained, see *Lücke*, Progr. in loc. Col. i. 24 (Götting. 1833, 4to.) p. 12 sq., and *Huther* and *Mey.* in loc.

Some refer the Genitive οἴκου in Heb. iii. 3 to τιμήν, *greater honor of the house* (i.e. in, from, the house), etc. This construction, though not of itself inadmissible, is, for this writer, stiff, and clearly opposed to his design; see Bleek.

On the Genitive of apposition in particular, as πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόῤῥας 2 Pet. ii. 6 (urbs *Romae*), σημεῖον περιτομῆς Rom. iv. 11, see § 59, 8, p. 531.

3. It was long usual to regard the Genitive of Relationship as a Genitive with an ellipsis; as, *Μαρία Ἰακώβου, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου,*
179 *Δαυὶδ ὁ τοῦ Ἰεσσαί.* But as the Genitive is the case of dependence,
7th ed. and as every relationship is a sort of dependence, there is no essential notion wanting in such expressions (Hm. Ellips. p. 120); only the thought which the Gen. expresses in a very general way (Plato, rep. 3, 408 b.) is left to be defined by the reader according to the facts in the case. Most frequently this Gen. implies son or daughter; as, Matt. iv. 21; Jno. vi. 71; xxi. 2, 15; Acts xiii. 22. But *μήτηρ* is to be understood in Luke xxiv. 10; Mark xv. 47; xvi. 1, cf. Matt. xxvii. 56; Mark xv. 40 (Aelian. 16, 30 *Ὀλυμπιὰς ἡ Ἀλεξάνδρου* sc. *μήτηρ*), *πατήρ* in Acts vii. 16 *Ἐμμὼρ τοῦ Συχέμ* (cf. Gen. xxxiii. 19; similar in Steph. Byzant. under *Δαίδαλα*: *ἡ πόλις ἀπὸ Δαιδάλου τοῦ Ἰκάρου*), *γυνή* in Matt. i. 6 *ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Οὐρίου* and Jno. xix. 25 (see my RWB. II. 57 f.) cf. Aristoph. eccl. 46; Plin. epp. 2, 20 Verania Pisonis; *ἀδελφός* perhaps in Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13 *Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου*, if the same apostle is mentioned in Jude 1 (cf. Alciphr. 2, 2 *Τιμοκράτης ὁ Μητροδώρου* sc. *ἀδελφός*). Such designation in the circle of the Apostles might have arisen from the circumstance that James, the brother of Judas, was better known or more prominent than the father of Judas. See, in general, Bos, ellips. ed. Schaef. under the words; Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 307.

In 1 Cor. i. 11 οἱ Χλόης are, accordingly, *Chloe's people*, as in Rom. xvi. 10, 11 οἱ Ἀριστοβούλου, οἱ Ναρκίσσου. A more definite explanation must be supplied by the facts of the case. Perhaps we should here understand, with most expositors, *the members of the household* of these persons. Others understand *the slaves*. To the original readers the expression was clear. Further, see Valcken. in loc.

204 Note 1. It is not unusual, especially in Paul's style, to find *three* Genitives connected together, and grammatically governed one by another.
172 Frequently, however, one of them is employed instead of an adjective:
6th ed. 2 Cor. iv. 4 *τὸν φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, Eph. i. 6 *εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*, iv. 13 *εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας τοῦ πληρώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ* (where the last two Genitives go together), i. 19; Rom. ii. 4; Col. i. 20; ii. 12, 18; 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 Thess. i. 9; Rev. xviii. 3; xxi. 6; Heb. v. 12; 2 Pet. iii. 2, cf. Krüger, Xen. A. 2, 5, 38; Bornem. Xenoph. Apol.

p. 44; Boisson. Babr. p. 116. In Rev. xiv. 10 (xix. 15) οἶνος τοῦ θυμοῦ must be taken together: *wine of wrath*, burning wine, according to an O.T. figure. Four Genitives occur in Rev. xiv. 8 ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς, xvi. 19; xix. 15 (Judith ix. 8; x. 3; xiii. 18; Wisd. xiii. 5, etc.). On the other hand, in 2 Cor. iii. 6 διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης οὐ γράμματος ἀλλὰ πνεύματος the last two Genitives must, on account of verse 7, be considered as both dependent on the principal noun. In Rom. xi. 33 all the three Genitives, in the same way, refer to βάθος.

Note 2. Sometimes, particularly in Paul's epistles, the Genitive (when placed after) is separated from its governing noun by another word; as, 180
Phil. ii. 10 ἵνα πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων 7th ed.
(Genitives subjoined in explanation of πᾶν γόνυ), Rom. ix. 21 ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τοῦ πηλοῦ; 1 Tim. iii. 6 ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ διαβόλου (probably for emphasis), 1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 7; Heb. viii. 5; Jno. xii. 11; 1 Pet. iii. 21. Otherwise still in Rev. vii. 17. On the other hand, in Eph. ii. 3 ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, a different position of the words was hardly possible, if an unsuitable stress (ἦμεν φύσει τέκ. ὀργ.) was not to fall on φύσει. See, in general, Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 46; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 241; Fr. Rom. II. 331.

Note 3. Rarely two Genitives of *different* relations (particularly the one of a person, the other of a thing), mostly also separated from each other by position, are joined to *a single* noun (Krü. 33), e.g. Acts v. 32 ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν αὐτοῦ (Χριστοῦ) μάρτυρες τῶν ῥημάτων τούτων, 2 Cor. v. 1 ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους, Phil. ii. 30 τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς λειτουργίας, 2 Pet. iii. 2 τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, [Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης,] Heb. xiii. 7, cf. Her. 6, 2 τὴν Ἰώνων τὴν ἡγεμονίην τοῦ πρὸς Δαρεῖον πολέμου, Thuc. 3, 12 τὴν ἐκείνων μέλλησιν τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς δεινῶν, 6, 18 ἡ Νικίου τῶν λόγων ἀπραγμοσύνη, Plat. legg. 3, 690 b. τὴν τοῦ νόμου ἑκόντων ἀρχήν, rep. 1, 329 b. τὰς τῶν οἰκείων προπηλακίσεις τοῦ γήρως, Diog. L. 3, 37 and very strained Plat. Apol. 40 c. μετοίκησις τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἐνθένδε, see Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 329; ad legg. p. 84 sq.; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 219; Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 17, and Soph. Philoctet. v. 751; Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 111 sq.; Bhdy. 162; Mtth. 864 (Kritz, Sallust. II. 170).

To this head we may also refer 1 Pet. iii. 21 σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπου *the flesh's putting away of filth* (σὰρξ ἀποτίθεται ῥύπον), unless there be here a transposition.

In a different way two Genitives are connected together in Jno. vi. 1 ἡ θάλασσα τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος *the Sea of Galilee, of Tiberias.* 205
Under the last name alone it occurs the second time in Jno. xxi. 1. Perhaps for the sake of foreign readers John annexed the more definite to the more general designation (cf. Pausan. 5, 7, 3) that they might determine the locality more certainly. Beza in loc. takes a different view. Kühnöl's suspicion, that the words τῆς Τιβ. are a gloss, is hasty. The explanation 173
of Paulus, however, — *setting sail from Tiberias* — if not at variance with 6th ed.

classic prose, is opposed to the style of the N. T. (cf. Bornem. Acta p. 149), which, in such circumstances, prefers to the simple case the more vivid mode of expression by means of the preposition. Τιβ. cannot be made to depend on the ἀπό in ἀπῆλθεν.

Note 4. The Genitive, when placed *before* the governing noun, either a. belongs to two nouns at the same time, as in Acts iii. 7 αὐτοῦ αἱ βάσεις καὶ τὰ σφυρά, Jno. xi. 48, or b. is emphatic (Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 118; Mdv. 13), as e.g. in 1 Cor. iii. 9 θεοῦ γάρ ἐσμεν συνεργοί, θεοῦ γεώργιον, θεοῦ οἰκοδομή ἐστε, Acts xiii. 23 τούτου (Δαυὶδ) ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ σπέρματος ...
181 ἤγαγε σωτῆρα Ἰησοῦν, Jas. i. 26 εἴ τις ... τούτου μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία, iii. 3;
7th ed. Heb. x. 36; Eph. ii. 8. The emphasis is not unfrequently founded in an expressed antithesis: Phil. ii. 25 τὸν συστρατιώτην μου, ὑμῶν δὲ ἀπόστολον καὶ λειτουργὸν τῆς χρείας μου, Matt. i. 18; Heb. vii. 12, 1 Pet. iii. 21; Eph. ii. 10; vi. 9; Gal. iii. 15; iv. 28; 1 Cor vi. 15; Rom. iii. 29; xiii. 4. The Genitive, however, for the most part contains the principal notion: Rom. xi. 13 ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος *apostle of the Gentiles*, 1 Tim. vi. 17 ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι *upon riches which are perishable*, Tit. i. 7; Heb. vi. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 14. That the placing of the Genitive before the governing noun belongs to the peculiarities of diction of a particular author (Gersdorf 296 ff.), though not in itself impossible (since emphatic combinations are weakened by individual writers), at least cannot be shown to be probable. Cf. moreover, Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 243. Heb. vi. 2 is a difficult passage; βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς (depending on θεμέλιον) certainly belong together, and διδαχῆς cannot be torn away so strangely and regarded as the governing noun to all four Genitives, as Ebrard still maintains. But the question is, whether we should here admit a transposition for διδαχῆς βαπτισμῶν, as most later expositors do. Such a transposition, however, would be at variance with the whole structure of the verse; and if βαπτισμοὶ διδαχῆς is translated *doctrinal baptisms*, baptisms in connection with instruction, to distinguish them from the legal baptisms (lustrations) of Judaism, this appellation is confirmed as distinctively Christian by Matt. xxviii. 19 βαπτίσαντες αὐτούς ... διδάσκοντες αὐτούς. Ebrard's objection, that Christian baptism is distinguished from mere lustrations, not by instruction, but by the forgiveness of sins and regeneration, amounts to nothing, for Matt. xxviii. says nothing about the forgiveness of sins. As regards the use of the word βαπτισμός, and in the Plural too, what Tholuck has already remarked may be used also in support of the above explanation.

206 Note 5. Kühnöl and others consider περί with the Acc. in Mark iv. 19 αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι as a circumlocution for the Genitive. But, though Mark might have written αἱ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπιθ., yet the former expression is not only more definite, but περί obviously retains its force: cupiditates, quae *circa* reliqua (rel. res) versantur (Heliod. 1, 23, 45 ἐπιθυμία περὶ τὴν Χαρίκλειαν, Aristot. rhet. 2, 12 αἱ περὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐπιθυμίαι), just as (with the Gen.) in Jno. xv. 22. It is another thing when, in

Greek authors, περί with the Acc. is used as a circumlocution for the 174
Genitive of an object to which a certain quality is ascribed, e.g. Diod. S. 6th ed.
11, 89 ἡ περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀρχαιότης, and again τὸ περὶ τοὺς κρατῆρας ἰδίωμα (cf. Schaef. Julian. p. VI. and Dion. comp. p. 23). With more reason might it be said that in 1 Cor. vii. 37 ἐξουσία περὶ τοῦ ἰδίου θελήματος this preposition is used with the Gen. as a circumlocution for the Genitive, because the Genitive alone might also have been employed; but *power over* (with respect to) *his own will*, is at all events the more definite and full expression. Expositors find a similar circumlocution for the Gen. by means of ἀπό and ἐκ in Acts xxiii. 21 τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν, 2 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν ἀγάπῃ. This, however, is literally amor qui *a vobis* proficiscitur, promissio a te 182
profecta, and is more precise than τῇ ὑμῶν ἀγάπῃ, which might also mean 7th ed.
amor in vos.[1] So Thuc. 2, 92 ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων βοήθεια, Dion. H. IV. 2235 πολὺν ἐκ τῶν παρόντων κινήσας ἔλεον, Plato, rep. 2, 363 a. τὰς ἀπ' αὐτῆς εὐδοκιμήσεις, Demosth. pac. 24 b.; Polyaen. 5, 11; D. S. 1, 8; 5, 39; Exc. Vat. p. 117; Lucian. conscr. hist. 40; cf. Jacobs, Athen. 321 sq. and Anthol. pal. I. 1, 159; Schaef. Soph. Aj. p. 228; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 329. Also Rom. xi. 27 ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη must be explained in the same way. Cf. Xen. C. 5, 5, 13; Isocr. Demon. p. 18; Arrian. Al. 5, 18, 10 (Fr. in loc. and Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 193). On Jno. i. 14 see Lücke. None of these passages contains an unmeaning circumlocution. And in 1 Cor. ii. 12 οὐ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ κόσμου ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ, the apostle has of set purpose employed in the parallel τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ (not τὸ πν. θεοῦ or τὸ θεοῦ). No tolerably attentive reader will admit the alleged circumlocution for the Gen. by means of ἐν (see Koppe, Eph. p. 60), in proof of which 1 Cor. ii. 7; Eph. ii. 21; Tit. iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 7 are adduced. Nor does κατά constitute a mere circumlocution for the Genitive in the examples usually quoted. In Rom. ix. 11 ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις means the purpose according to, in consequence of, election. In Rom. xi. 21 οἱ κατὰ φύσιν κλάδοι are the branches according to nature i.e. the natural branches. So Heb. xi. 7 ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη. In Heb. ix. 19, too, κατὰ τὸν νόμον, if referred to πάσης ἐντολῆς, would not be put for τοῦ νόμου, as Bleek perceived. Yet, see above, § 22, 7. More pertinent examples are found in Greek writers; as, Diod. S. 1, 65 ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἀπόθεσις *the abdication of the government* (literally, as regards the government), 4, 13; Exc. Vat. p. 103; Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 12; Mtth. 866. On εὐαγγ. κατὰ Ματθ. etc. see 207
Fr. (cf. instances in the nova biblioth. Lubec. II. 105 sq.). It is quite erroneous to take τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα 1 Pet. i. 11 for τὰ Χριστοῦ παθήματα (v. 1). It means (similar to περὶ τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος vs. 10) *the sufferings* (destined) *for Christ*.

It is a different matter, when a Genitive dependent on a noun is rendered by means of a preposition because the (corresponding) *verb* prefers this construction; as, κοινωνία ὑμῶν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Phil. i. 5 cf. iv. 15.

[1] 2 Cor. ix. 2 ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν ζῆλος ἠρέθισε τοὺς πλείονας is referable to attraction.

So probably also ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν (*after God*) 1 Pet. iii. 21, cf. 2 Sam. xi. 7 ἐπερωτᾶν εἰς θεόν.

175 4. The same sort of direct dependence occurs in the connection
6th ed. of the Genitive with verbal adjectives and participles whose signification is not such that they (the verbs from which they come) could regularly govern the Genitive (2 Pet. ii. 14 μεστοὺς μοιχαλίδος, Matt. x. 10 ἄξιος τῆς τροφῆς, Heb. iii. 1 κλήσεως μέτοχοι etc. see No. 8; Eph. ii. 12 ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν etc.); as, 1 Cor. ii. 13 λόγοι διδακτοὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου, see above, p. 189, 2 Pet. ii. 14 καρδίαν γεγυμνασμένην πλεονεξίας cf. Iliad. 5, 6 λελουμένος ὠκεάνοιο, Soph.
183 Aj. 807 φωτὸς ἠπατημένη, 1353 φίλων νικώμενος, and with 1 Cor.
7th ed. especially Soph. El. 344 κείνης διδακτά, with 2 Pet. Philostr. her. 2, 15 θαλάττης οὔπω γεγυμνασμένοι, 3, 1 Νέστορα πολέμων πολλῶν γεγυμνασμένον, 10, 1 σοφίας ἤδη γεγυμνασμένον, see Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 451. We resolve all these Genitives by a preposition: taught of (by) the Holy Spirit, bathed in the ocean, inured to the sea, etc. And perhaps in the simple language of antiquity the Genitive in such constructions was regarded as the *whence* case; see Hartung, S. 17. According to this view the two following passages also are easily explained: Heb. iii. 12 καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας *a heart evil* (with respect to) *unbelief* (where ἀπιστία is that which establishes the πονηρία; substantively πονηρία ἀπιστίας the Genitive (of apposition) would seem quite natural; similarly Wisd. xviii. 3 ἥλιον ἀβλαβῆ φιλοτίμου ξενιτείας παρέσχες, see Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 751; Mtth. 811, 818. Secondly, Jas. i. 13 ἀπείραστος κακῶν, which most expositors render: *untempted* (that cannot be tempted) *by evil* (cf. Soph. Antig. 847 ἄκλαυτος φίλων, Aeschyl. Theb. 875 κακῶν ἀτρυμονες Schwenck, Aeschyl. Eumen. 96); Schulthess, however, translates it: *inexperienced in evil.* The parallelism with πειράζει does not favor the last interpretation. The active acceptation in the Aethiopic version, *not tempting to evil*, is to be rejected more on the ground that the πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα following would be tautological (for the apostle, as the δέ shows,
208 must intend to say something different from ἀπείρ.), and also that ἀπείρ. does not occur in the active sense, than, as Schulth. thinks, on account of the Genitive κακῶν.[1] The Genitive has great latitude of import, at least in the poets and in such writers as approach a poetic or rhetorical diction. Ἀπείρ. κακῶν might denote *not tempting in respect to evil*, just as well as in Soph. Aj. 1405 λουτρῶν

[1] On the active and passive acceptation of verbals see *Wex*, Soph. Antig. I. 162.

ὁσίων ἐπίκαιρος suitable for holy washings, or in Her. 1, 196 *παρθένοι γάμων ὡραῖαι ripe for marriage.*

Paul's expression κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Rom. i. 6 should not be brought under this rule, as is still done by Thiersch. It means, according to the apostle's view of κλῆσις elsewhere, *Christ's called*, i.e. *called* (by God) who are *Christ's*, belong to Christ. On the other hand, we may refer to this head ὅμοιός τινος Jno. viii. 55 (this adj. regularly governs the Dat. [which case, indeed, even in the passage just mentioned Lchm. placed in the text, but against the balance of authorities and against Cod. Sin. also]) Mtth. 873; 176
Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 104; III. 46 (on similis *alicuius* and the like, 6th ed.
see Zumpt, lat. Gr. S. 365 f.), and ἐγγύς with the Gen. Jno. xi. 18; Rom. x. 8; xiii. 11; Heb. vi. 8; viii. 13, etc., the usual construction here, along with which, however, ἐγγύς τινι occurs; see Bleek, Hebr. II. II. 209; Mtth. 812. Even adjectives compounded with σύν are sometimes followed by 184
the Genitive; as, σύμμορφος τῆς εἰκόνος Rom. viii. 29 (Mtth. 864). 7th ed.

5. Most closely related to the simple Genitive of dependence after substantives and in reality only an expansion of that Genitive into a clause, is the very common εἶναί or γίνεσθαί τινος. This construction has a still more diversified use in Greek prose (Krü. 28 f.; Mdv. 57 f.; Ast, Lexic. Platon. I. 621), than in the N. T.; and was formerly explained by assuming that a preposition or a substantive was understood.

In the N. T. may be distinguished,

a. The Genitive of the whole, of the class (Plur.) and of the sphere (Sing.) to which one belongs, 1 Tim. i. 20 *ὧν ἐστὶν Ὑμεναῖος of whom is* (to whom belongs) *Hym.*, 2 Tim. i. 15; Acts xxiii. 6 (1 Macc. ii. 18; Plato, Protag. 342 e.; Xen. A. 1, 2, 3), 1 Thess. v. 5, 8 *οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους ... ἡμεῖς ἡμέρας ὄντες belonging to the night, to the day*, Acts ix. 2.

b. The Genitive of the ruler, master, possessor, etc., Matt. xxii. 28 *τίνος τῶν ἑπτὰ ἔσται γυνή;* 1 Cor. iii. 21 *πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστιν* (Xen. A. 2, 1, 4; Ptol. 1, 8, 1), vi. 19 *οὐκ ἐστὲ ἑαυτῶν ye are not your own — do not belong to yourselves*, 2 Cor. iv. 7 *ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως ᾖ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν that ... may be God's and not of us*, x. 7 *Χριστοῦ εἶναι*, Rom. viii. 9 (similarly 1 Cor. i. 12 of heads of parties *ἐγώ εἰμι Παύλου*, cf. Diog. L. 6, 82). Close to 209
this comes Acts i. 7 *οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστι γνῶναι* etc. *it does not belong to you — it is not in your power to know* (Plato, Gorg. 500 a.; Xen. Oec. 1, 2), Mark xii. 7 *ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία* (Matt. v. 3), 1 Pet. iii. 3, further Heb. v. 14 *τελείων ἐστὶν ἡ στερεὰ τροφή belongs to* (is for) *mature persons*, etc.

c. The Genitive of a quality in which one participates (sing. abstract), in diversified applications, 1 Cor. xiv. 33 *οὐκ ἔστιν ἀκαταστασίας ὁ θεός*, Heb. x. 39 *ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς ... ἀλλὰ πίστεως* etc. (Plato, apol. 28 a.). Likewise the concrete Gen. Acts ix. 2 *τινὰς τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας*, particularly the Genitive of age, Mark v. 42 *ἦν ἐτῶν δώδεκα*, Luke ii. 42; iii. 23; Acts iv. 22; Tob. xiv. 2, 11; Plato, legg. 4, 721 a. In these passages the subject is a person, but in the following it is a thing: Heb. xii. 11 *πᾶσα παιδεία οὐ δοκεῖ χαρᾶς εἶναι is not* (matter) *of joy* (this, however, might be referred also to a.), 2 Pet. i. 20 *πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται*. Moreover, this construction of *εἰμί*, when persons are the subject, is sometimes made more animated, in Oriental style, by the insertion of *υἱός* or *τέκνον*; cf. 1 Thess. v. 5 *ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας*.[1]

The same relations are expressed by the Genitive when the verb *εἶναι* is omitted, Phil. iii. 5 *ἐγὼ ... φυλῆς Βενιαμίν*.

6. The Genitive, as the clearly defined case of *departure, motion*
185 *whence*, appears, too, in the diction of the N. T., joined to verbs
7th ed. (and adjectives), with a diversity of application natural to this rela-
177 tion. (This diversity, however, is more copious in Greek prose, and
6th ed. in the N. T. the Gen. is frequently strengthened by prepositions.) As *separation* from is related to proceeding from, and as that which departs and is separated may often be conceived as a *part* of the remaining whole, the Genitive, because the case of proceeding from, is also naturally the case of *separation* and of *partition*. The former, the Genitive of *separation* and *removal*, as the more limited, we shall illustrate first.

As words which express the idea of separation or removal are usually construed with the Genitive by the Greeks even in prose,— e.g. *ἐλευθεροῦν τινος* to free *from* something, *κωλύειν, ὑποχωρεῖν, παύειν, διαφέρειν, ὑστερεῖν τινος*, see Mtth. 829 ff., 845; Bhdy. 179 f. (although in such circumstances suitable prepositions are pretty frequently inserted),—so in the N. T. also the following verbs are construed with the Genitive: *μεταστῆναι* Luke xvi. 4, *ἀστοχεῖν* 1 Tim. i. 6, *παύεσθαι* 1 Pet. iv. 1, *κωλύειν* Acts xxvii. 43 (cf. Xen. C. 2, 4, 23; Anab. 1, 6, 2; Pol. 2, 52, 8 a.), *διαφέρειν* Matt. x. 31; 1 Cor. xv. 41 etc. (Xen. C. 8, 2, 21, cf. Krü. Dion. H. p. 462), *ἀπο-*
210 *στερεῖσθαι* 1 Tim. vi. 5,[2] also *ὑστερεῖν to be behind one* 2 Cor. xi. 5;

[1] We Germans also say both *du bist des Todes* and *du bist ein Kind des Todes*. But this does not prove that the former expression is elliptical (*Kuinoel* ad Heb. x. 39).

[2] *Lachm.*, on the authority of good Codd., has adopted in Acts xix. 27 ... *μέλλειν τε*

xii. 11, see Bleek on Heb. iv. 1 and *ξένοι τῶν διαθηκῶν* Eph. ii. 12.

The interposition of prepositions, however, predominates:

a. With verbs of *disjoining*, *freeing*, and *being free*, invariably (Mtth. 665; Bhdy. 181); as, *χωρίζειν ἀπό* Rom. viii. 35; 1 Cor. vii. 10; Heb. vii. 26 (Plat. Phaed. 67 c., but Polyb. 5, 111, 2); *λύειν ἀπό* Luke xiii. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 27; *ἐλευθεροῦν ἀπό* Rom. vi. 18, 22; viii. 2, 21 (Thuc. 2, 71, also with *ἐκ* Mtth. 830); *ῥύεσθαι ἀπό* Matt. vi. 13 (2 Sam. xix. 9; Ps. xvi. 13 f.), with *ἐκ* Luke i. 74; Rom. vii. 24, etc., Exod. vi. 6; Job xxxiii. 30; Ps. lxviii. 15; *σώζειν ἀπό* Rom. v. 9 (Ps. lxviii. 15), and more frequently with *ἐκ*, as in Jas. v. 20; Heb. v. 7 (2 Sam. xxii. 3 f.; 1 Kings xix. 17); *λυτροῦν ἀπό* Tit. ii. 14; Ps. cxviii. 134 (but λ. *τινος* Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 710); *καθαρίζειν ἀπό* 1 Jno. i. 7; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Heb. ix. 14, accordingly *καθαρὸς ἀπό* Acts xx. 26, cf. Tob. iii. 14; Demosth. Neaer. 528 c. (with *ἐκ* Appian. Syr. 59) and *ἀθῷος ἀπό* (נְקִי מִן) Matt. xxvii. 24, cf. Krebs, observ. 73; Gen. xxiv. 41; Num. v. 19, 31, with Dat. Josh. ii. 17, 19 f.; similarly *λούειν ἀπό* (concisely for *by washing cleanse from*) Acts xvi. 33; Rev. i. 5.

b. Where the construction with the Genitive alone is also used; as, *ἀναπαύεσθαι ἐκ τῶν κόπων* Rev. xiv. 13, *παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν ἀπὸ κακοῦ* 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Esth. ix. 16; Soph. Electr. 987; Thuc. 7, 73); *ὑστερεῖν ἀπό* Heb. xii. 15 is probably a pregnant construction. 186 7th ed.

The notion of *separation* and *removal* lies at the basis also of the Hellenistic construction *κρύπτειν* (*τι*) *ἀπό τινος* Luke xix. 42 (for which classic authors use *κρύπτειν τινά τι*); it is properly a constructio praegnans (cf. Sept. Gen. iv. 14; xviii. 17; 1 Sam. iii. 18, etc.). To verbs of *remaining behind* anything (*ὑστερεῖν τινος*) may be referred 2 Pet. iii. 9 *οὐ βραδύνει ὁ κύριος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας* (*οὐ βραδύς ἐστι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας*), cf. *ὑστέρουν τῆς βοηθείας* Diod. S. 13, 110. Even the Syriac has joined *ἐπαγγ.* with *βραδ.* 178 6th ed.

7. The Genitive of *proceeding from* and of derivation occurs in prose in its simplest form in *ἄρχομαί τινος* I begin *from* (with) something (Hartung, 14), *δέχομαί τινος* I receive *from* somebody (Hm. Vig. 877), *δέομαί τινος* I beg *of* some one (Mtth. 834), *ἀκούω τινός* I hear *from* somebody; then *γεύομαί*, *ἐσθίω τινός* (e.g. *ἄρτου*, *μέλιτος*) I taste, eat, *of* something, *ὀνίνημί τινος* I derive advantage, enjoyment, *from* something; finally *δίδωμί τινος*, *λαμβάνω τινός* I give, take, *of* something; Hm. Opusc. I. 178. The Genitive denotes in all these cases the object out of which *hearing*, *eating*, *giving* etc. comes; 211

καὶ καθαιρεῖσθαι τῆς μεγαλειότητος αὐτῆς. Still I agree with *Mey.* in thinking this reading (which most probably is an error of the transcribers, see *Bengel*) too weak for the style of the passage.

from which that proceeds which is eaten, tasted, given, etc.; and, in the last expressions, indicates the mass, the whole, of which a part is enjoyed, given, etc. Consequently these Genitives may be regarded also as Genitivi partitivi; for when the whole, or the object simply, is meant, the strict Object-case, the Accusative, is used. In the diction of the N. T. the Genitive, in many of those constructions, is strengthened by a preposition. As respects details we notice,

a. *Δέομαι* has without exception the Genitive of the person (Matt. ix. 38; Luke v. 12; viii. 28; Acts viii. 22, etc.), the object of request being subjoined in the Acc.; as, 2 Cor. viii. 4 *δεόμενοι ἡμῶν τὴν χάριν* etc. (Weber, Demosth. p. 163).

b. Of verbs of *giving* with the Genitive we have only *one* instance, Rev. ii. 17 *δώσω αὐτῷ τοῦ μάννα* (where some Codd. have *δ. α. φαγεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ μ.* as a correction).[1] On the other hand, in Rom. i. 11; 1 Thess. ii. 8 the apostle could not have written *μεταδιδόναι χαρίσματος* or *εὐαγγελίου* (Mtth. 798), as in the first passage a particular charisma as a whole (in fact he says *χάρισμά τι*) is meant; and in the second, the Gospel as something indivisible. Paul did not purpose to communicate a portion of (*from*) a spiritual gift, or a portion of (*from*) the Gospel.

c. Verbs of *enjoying* or *partaking*: *προσλαμβάνεσθαι τροφῆς* Acts xxvii. 36, *μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς* Acts ii. 46; xxvii. 33 f., *γεύεσθαι τοῦ δείπνου* Luke xiv. 24 (figuratively Heb. vi. 4 *γεύεσθαι τῆς δωρεᾶς*
187 *τ. ἐπουρανίου, γεύεσθαι θανάτου* Matt. xvi. 28; Luke ix. 27; Heb. ii.
7th ed. 9, etc.), and with Gen. of pers. Philem. 20 *ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην ἐν κυρίῳ* (cf. also Odyss. 19, 68), Rom. xv. 24 *ἐὰν ὑμῶν ... ἐμπλησθῶ*. But *γεύεσθαι* governs also the Acc.: Jno. ii. 9 *ἐγεύσατο τὸ ὕδωρ*,
179 Heb. vi. 5[2] (as frequently in Hebraizing Greek, Job. xii. 11; Sirach
6th ed. xxxvi. 24; Tob. vii. 11; but probably never in Greek authors).[3]

[1] This very passage clearly shows the distinction between the Genitive and the Acc., for *καὶ δώσω ψῆφον λευκήν* follows; cf. Heliod. 2, 23, 100 *ἐπερρόφουν ὁ μὲν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὁ δὲ καὶ οἶνον*.

[2] *Bengel*, on Heb. vi. 4, appears to trifle in attempting to make a distinction in this passage between *γεύεσθαι* with the Gen. and with the Acc.

[3] In the sense of *eating up, consuming*, *φαγεῖν* and *ἐσθίειν* have regularly the Acc. (Matt. xii. 4; Rev. x. 10): cf., for distinction, 1 Cor. ix. 7. They also take the Acc. when one's food in general, merely, is described, — of which he ordinarily makes use, which he lives upon; e.g. Mark i. 6 *ἦν Ἰωάννης ... ἐσθίων ἀκρίδας καὶ μέλι ἄγριον*, Rom. xiv. 21; Matt. xv. 2; 1 Cor. viii. 7; x. 3 f. (Jno. vi. 58), cf. Diog. L. 6, 45. It may be stated generally, that *ἐσθίειν τι* would in no passage be found to be entirely without justification (cf. even 2 Thess. iii. 12) and thus the absence of *ἐσθίειν τινός* (together with *ἀπό* or *ἔκ τινος*) would cease to be strange. Luke xv. 16 *ἀπὸ τῶν κεράτιων ὧν ἤσθιον οἱ χοῖροι* is probably an attraction. Besides, we find *ἐσθίειν, πίνειν τι* regularly in the Sept. also; only in Num. xx. 19 *ἐὰν τοῦ ὕδατός σου πίωμεν* occurs.

Verbs of *eating of* as well as *giving* and *taking of* are, moreover, 212
in the N. T. invariably joined to their nouns by prepositions:

a) By *ἀπό*; as, Luke xxiv. 42 *ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ... ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου*, xx. 10; Matt. xv. 27 *τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν παιδίων* (cf. אָכַל מִן and *φαγεῖν ἀπό* Fabric. Pseudepigr. 1. 706), Luke xxii. 18 *οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ γενν ήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου*, cf. Jer. li. (xxviii.) 7, Acts ii. 17 *ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τ. πνεύματός μου* (LXX.), v. 2 *καὶ ἐνοσφίσατο ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς*, Jno. xxi. 10 *ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ τῶν ὀψαρίων*, Mark xii. 2 *ἵνα ... λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος*.

b) By *ἐκ*; as, 1 Cor. xi. 28 *ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐσθιέτω*, ix. 7 (2 Sam. xii. 3; 2 Kings iv. 40; Sir. xi. 17; Judith xii. 2); Jno. iv. 14 *ὃς ἂν πίῃ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος*,[1] vi. 50 *ὁ ἄρτος ... ἵνα τις ἐξ αὐτοῦ φάγῃ*, 1 Jno. iv. 13 *ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν*. But we must not refer to this head Heb. xiii. 10 *φαγεῖν ἐκ θυσιαστηρίου*, as if it were equivalent to *ἐκ θυσίας*; for *θυσιαστ.* means *altar*. To *eat* of the altar is simply equivalent to, of the sacrifice (offered on the altar). Probably there is no instance of *ἐσθίειν ἀπό* or *ἐκ* in classic Greek; but *ἀπολαύειν ἀπό τινος* is akin to it, Plat. rep. 3, 395 c.; 10, 606 b.; Apol. 31 b.

Of verbs of *perceiving*, *ἀκούω* is construed with the Genitive of the person (to hear *from—out of*—one), to hear one; as, Matt. xvii. 5; Mark vii. 14; Luke ii. 46; Jno. iii. 29; ix. 31; Rev. vi. 1, 3; Rom. x. 14[2]—(the object is expressed in the Acc., Acts i. 4 *ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου*, Lucian. dial. deor. 20, 13). Yet we find likewise *ἀκούειν* 188
τι ἀπό in 1 Jno. i. 5, *ἐκ* in 2 Cor. xii. 6 (also Odyss. 15, 374), *παρά* 7th ed.
in Acts x. 22, where in classic Greek the Gen. alone would have been sufficient. A Genitive of the thing occurs with *ἀκούω* in Jno. v. 25; Heb. iv. 7 *ἀκ. φωνῆς*, Luke xv. 25 *ἤκουσε συμφωνίας καὶ χορῶν*, Mark xiv. 64 *ἠκούσατε τῆς βλασφημίας*, 1 Macc. x. 34; Bar. iii. 4 (Lucian. Halc. 2; gall. 10; Xen. C. 6, 2, 13, etc.). On the 180
other hand, the Accusative follows in Luke v. 1 *ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον* 6th ed. 213
τ. θεοῦ, Jno. viii. 40 *τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τ. θεοῦ* etc. In the last passages the object is referred to as a connected whole, and the hearing meant is intellectual; while in the previous passages

[1] Otherwise in 1 Cor. x. 4 *ἔπινον ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας*, where *Flatt's* explanation is a failure.

[2] Others, *Rück.* and *Fr.*, take the Genitive of the person here *οὗ οὐκ ἤκουσαν* thus: *of whom* (de quo) they have not heard (as *ἀκούειν τινός* is used also in Iliad. 24, 490). This does not appear to me probable (the construction in this sense is entirely poetical), much less necessary: one hears Christ when one hears the Gospel in which he speaks; and thus *ἀκούειν Χριστόν* Eph. iv. 21 is said of those who have not heard Christ in person. *Philippi* on the passage is superficial.

the object is primarily certain sounds only, or words received by the bodily ear. Cf. Rost 532 f.

The Genitive with τυγχάνειν (ἐπιτυγχάνειν) which invariably occurs in the N. T. (on the Acc. see Hm. Vig. 760; Bhdy. 176),[1] as in Luke xx. 35; Acts xxiv. 3; xxvii. 3, etc., is perhaps in its origin to be explained by the preceding rule; yet we find it also where the *whole* object is meant. In the same way the earlier Greek authors almost always construe κληρονομεῖν (*inherit*, also *participate in*) with the Genitive (Kypke II. 381), but the later and the N. T. writers connect with it the Accusative of the thing; as, Matt. v. 4; xix. 29; Gal. v. 21 (Polyb. 15, 22, 3) see Fischer-Well. III. I. 368; Lob. Phryn. 129; Mtth. 802.

Λαγχάνειν has the Accusative in Acts i. 17; 2 Pet. i. 1 ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσι πίστιν (where πίστις does not mean faith in an ideal sense, the faith in which every Christian gets a share by his conversion, but the subjective faith of *these* Christians) Mtth. 801. But in Luke i. 9 the Gen. is used (*to obtain by lot*); cf. Brunck, Soph. Electr. 364; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 803.

8. In the foregoing examples we already perceive that the notion of *proceeding from* something slides over into that of *participation in* something; but the partitive import of the Genitive is still more plainly disclosed in such combinations as μετέχειν τινός, πληροῦν τινος, θιγγάνειν τινός. With the Genitive are construed,

a. Words that express the notion of *having a share*, *partaking*, *wanting* (wishing to partake) Mtth. 797; as, κοινωνεῖν Heb. ii. 14, κοινωνός 1 Cor. x. 18; 1 Pet. v. 1, συγκοινωνός Rom. xi. 17, μετέχειν 1 Cor. ix. 12; x. 21; Heb. v. 13, μεταλαμβάνειν Heb. vi. 7; xii. 10, μέτοχος Heb. iii. 1, also χρήζειν[2] Matt. vi. 32; 2 Cor. iii. 1, etc., προσδεῖσθαι Acts xvii. 25. But κοινωνεῖν also takes — and in the
189 N. T. more commonly — the Dat. of the thing; as, 1 Tim. v. 22 μὴ
7th ed. κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις, Rom. xv. 27; 1 Pet. iv. 13; 2 Jno. 11
214 (Wisd. vi. 25), and in a transitive acceptation εἰς, Phil. iv. 15 οὐδεμία μοι ἐκκλησία ἐκοινώνησεν εἰς λόγον δόσεως. Cf. Plat. rep. 5, 453 b. δυνατὴ φύσις ἡ θήλεια τῇ τοῦ ἄῤῥενος γένους κοινωνῆσαι εἰς ἅπαντα τὰ ἔργα. Act. Apocr. p. 91. The Dat. of the thing with κοινωνεῖν and μετέχειν sometimes occurs in Greek authors (Thuc. 2, 16; Demosth. cor. c. 18) Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 77; and, in respect to κοινωνεῖν, is to be explained probably from the notion of *community* implied in the word (1 Tim., as above, cannot be resolved into

[1] But according to good authorities [Sin. also] ἐπιτυγχάνειν has the Acc. in Rom. xi. 7; see *Fr.*

[2] Though in Luke xi. 8 several Codd. have ὅσον χρήζει, neither from this, nor from the construction χρήζειν τι (*Mtth.* 834), should it be concluded, as is done by *Kühnöl.* that χρ. is construed with the Acc. also (in the sense of *desiring, demanding*).

μηδέν σοι καὶ ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρ. κοινὸν ἔστω). Further, μετέχειν is once construed with the interposition of ἐκ, 1 Cor. x. 17 ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν. I am not aware that a similar instance is to be found in any Greek author. 181 6th ed.

b. Words of *abounding*, *filling*,[1] *being empty*, *wanting* (Mtth. 826 ff.); as, Rom. xv. 13 ὁ θεὸς πληρώσαι ὑμᾶς πάσης χαρᾶς καὶ εἰρήνης, Luke i. 53 πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν, Acts v. 28 πεπληρώκατε τὴν Ἰερουσαλὴμ τῆς διδαχῆς ὑμῶν (ii. 28 Sept.), Jno. ii. 7 γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος (vi. 13), Matt. xxii. 10 ἐπλήσθη ὁ γάμος ἀνακειμένων (Acts xix. 29), Jno. i. 14 πλήρης χάριτος, 2 Pet. ii. 14 ὀφθαλμοὶ μεστοὶ μοιχαλίδος, Luke xi. 39 τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἁρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας, Jas. i. 5 εἴ τις ἡμῶν λείπεται σοφίας (Matthiae, Eurip. Hippol. 323), Rom. iii. 23 πάντες ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 237), see also Acts xiv. 17; xxvii. 38; Luke xv. 17; xxii. 35; Jno. xix. 29; Rom. xv. 14, 24; Rev. xv. 8. Verbs of fulness are but rarely joined to ἀπό (Luke xv. 16 ἐπεθύμει γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων, xvi. 21) or ἐκ (γεμίζειν ἐκ Rev. viii. 5; χορτάζ. ἐκ Rev. xix. 21, but χορτάζειν τινός Lam. iii. 15, 29, μεθύειν and μεθύσκεσθαι ἐκ Rev. xvii. 2, 6 cf. Lucian. dial. d. 6, 3).[2] Altogether solecistic is Rev. xvii. 3 γέμον τὰ ὀνόματα cf. 4. [This solecism is probably to be explained by the analogy of πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσ. Phil. i. 11 and the like.] The Dat. after πληροῦν, μεθύσκεσθαι etc. rests on a conception essentially different; see § 31, 7. How 1 Cor. i. 7 ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι must be taken, is obvious; cf. Plat. rep. 6, 484 d.

c. Verbs of *touching* (Mtth. 803) so far forth as the touching affects only a *part* of the object; as, Mark v. 30 ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων (vi. 56; Luke xxii. 51; Jno. xx. 17; 2 Cor. vi. 17, etc.), Heb. xii. 20 κἂν θηρίον θίγῃ τοῦ ὄρους (xi. 28). Under this head comes also Luke xvi. 24 βάπτειν ὕδατος, Bhdy. 168 (βάπτειν εἰς ὕδωρ Plato, Tim. 73 e.; Ael. 14, 39). 190 7th ed. 215

d. Verbs of *laying hold of*, when only a *part* of the whole is taken hold of; as, Matt. xiv. 31 ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ,

[1] To this head may be referred also πλούσιος with the Gen. Eurip. Orest. 394. In the N. T., however, the preposition ἐν is always used; as, Eph. ii. 4 πλούσιος ἐν ἐλέει (*rich in mercy*), Jas. ii. 5. Cf. πλουτεῖν, πλουτίζεσθαι ἔν τινι 1 Tim. vi. 18; 1 Cor. i. 5, etc.

[2] On πληθύνειν ἀπό Athen. 13, 569 see *Schweighaeus.* add. et corrig. p. 478. In Matt. xxiii. 25 ἔσωθεν γέμουσιν (cup and platter) ἐξ ἁρπαγῆς καὶ ἀκρασίας is probably to be rendered: *they are filled from plunder*, their contents arise from plunder. Luke, on the other hand, transfers the *fulness* to the Pharisees themselves, and therefore writes: τὸ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἁρπαγῆς etc. Likewise ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς in Jno. xii. 3 ἡ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου does not stand for the Genitive, but denotes that *wherefrom* the filling of the house came; *it was filled from* (by) *the odor of the ointment* (with fragrance).

cf. Theoph. ch. 4 (with his hand he could take hold of Peter, just in the act of sinking, by a part of the body only, perhaps by the arm), Luke ix. 47; in a different application Mark ix. 27 *κρατήσας αὐτὸν τῆς χειρός*, Acts iii. 7 *πιάσας αὐτὸν τῆς δεξιᾶς χειρός* (*by* the hand), cf. Plato, Parm. 126; Xen. A. 1, 6, 10; hence usually with the Genitive of a limb; as, Luke viii. 54 *κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς*, Acts xxiii. 19 (Isa. xli. 13; xlii. 6; Gen. xix. 16). On the other hand, *κρατεῖν* or *λαμβάνειν*, *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαί τινα* always denotes
182 seize, apprehend *one*, i.e. his whole person; as, Matt. xii. 11; xiv. 3;
6th ed. xviii. 28; Acts ix. 27; xvi. 19; [xviii. 17. Yet it is doubtful whether *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* is ever joined to an Acc. of the person, since (according to the analogy of Luke xiv. 4 *ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτόν*) the Acc. in Acts ix. 27 is probably governed by *ἤγαγεν*, in xvi. 19 by *εἵλκυσαν*, in xviii. 17 by *ἔτυπτον*. See also Mey. on Acts ix. 27 (3d ed.), and Bttm. Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 140]. The same distinction is observed in the figurative use of these verbs; as, Genitive, Heb. ii. 16; Luke i. 54; 1 Tim. vi. 2 (Xen. C. 2, 3, 6); Accusative, 2 Thess. ii. 15; Col. ii. 19, etc. But *κρατεῖν hold fast* Heb. iv. 14 and vi. 18 and *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι lay hold of* 1 Tim. vi. 12, 19 (Ael. 14, 27), are construed with the Genitive; in both instances, however, with reference to a good which is destined for many (*ὁμολογία*, *ἔλπις*), and which the individual, for his respective part, holds fast or attains. See, in general, Mtth. 803 f. In an ideal sense *ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι* is construed with a double Genitive; as, Luke xx. 20 *ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου that they might catch him by a word*, 26 *ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος* (cf. literally Xen. A. 4, 7, 12). Lastly, to this head is to be referred the construction *ἔχεσθαί τινος*, hold *by*, adhere *to* anything (pendere ex), Bleek, Heb. II. II. 220 f.; Mtth. 803, and *ἀντέχεσθαί τινος*. Both these verbs are thus used in the N. T. only in a figurative sense; as, Heb. vi. 9 *τὰ κρείσσονα καὶ ἐχόμενα σωτηρίας*, Matt. vi. 24 *τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει*, 1 Thess. v. 14 *ἀντέχεσθε τῶν ἀσθενῶν*, Tit. i. 9 *ἀντεχόμενος τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου*. Also *ἀνέχεσθαί τινος endure any thing* or *any one*, comes under this head, for it denotes properly *to hold to* a person or thing (Matt. xvii. 17; Heb. xiii. 22; Eph. iv. 2), cf. Kypke II. 93; likewise *ἔνοχός* (*ἐνεχόμενός*) *τινος*, as Matt. xxvi. 66 *ἔνοχος θανάτου*, or 1 Cor. xi. 27 *ἔνοχος τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου* (Jas.
216 ii. 10), for in all cases a being held by, bound to, something is expressed, — in the first passage, to a punishment which must be
191 suffered, in the second, to a matter for which satisfaction is due.
7th ed. See Fr. Mt. p. 223; Bleek, Hebr. II. I. 340 f.; cf. § 31, pp. 210, 213.

Note 1. The partitive Genitive is sometimes governed by an adverb; as, Heb. ix, 7 *ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ once a year*, [Matt. xxviii. 1 *ὀψὲ σαββάτων*], Luke xviii. 12; xvii. 4 (Ptol. geogr. 8, 15, 19; 8, 29, 31; 8, 16, 4, etc.) cf. Mdv. 54.

Note 2. The partitive Genitive occurs not merely in dependence, it also makes its appearance sometimes as subject; as, Xen. A. 3, 5, 16 *ὁπότε ... σπείσαιντο καὶ ἐπιμίγνυσθαι σφῶν τε πρὸς ἐκείνους καὶ ἐκείνων πρὸς αὐτούς and* (some) *of them have intercourse with those; of those, with them*, Thuc. 1, 115 (Theophan. I. 77). In the N. T. a similar construction occurs in Acts xxi. 16 *συνῆλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν σὺν ἡμῖν* (cf. Pseudarist. p. 120 Haverc. *ἐν οἷς καὶ βασιλικοὶ ἦσαν καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων ὑπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως*). In such cases, however, the Genitive is regularly accompanied by a preposition; as, Jno. xvi. 17 *εἶπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ* etc.

9. Moreover, the Genitive is easily to be recognized as the *whence* case when joined

a. to verbs of *accusing, arraigning* (*sentencing*) as Genitive of the thing (Mtth. 848), e.g. Acts xix. 40 *κινδυνεύομεν ἐγκαλεῖσθαι στάσεως*, xxv. 11 *οὐδέν ἐστιν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγοροῦσί μου*, Luke xxiii. 14 *οὐδὲν εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ* (yet we find also *περί τινος de aliqua re* Acts xxiii. 29; xxiv. 13, cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 7, 2, like *κρίνεσθαι περί τινος* Acts xxiii. 6; xxiv. 21); for the offence of which one is accused is that *from, out of* which 183
the *κατηγορεῖν* arises, or proceeds. We must not, however, fail to 6th ed.
mention that the two preceding verbs are usually in Greek authors construed differently, viz. *κατηγορεῖν τινός τι* (a construction which can hardly be proved to occur in the N. T. from Mark xv. 3, cf. Lucian. necyom. 19) and *ἐγκαλεῖν τινί τι* Mtth. 849 f.[1]

b. to *κατακαυχᾶσθαι* boast one's self *of* a thing (borrow glory *from* something) Jas. ii. 13. On the other hand, the construction *ἐπαινεῖν τινά τινος* (4 Macc. i. 10; iv. 4; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 661) does not occur in the N. T.; for in Luke xvi. 8 *τῆς ἀδικίας* is undoubtedly to be joined to *οἰκονόμος*, and the object of *ἐπαινεῖν* is expressed only in the clause *ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν*. In general, 217
see on the former construction (Sintenis) in the Leipz. L. Z. 1833, I. 1135. Like *ἐπαινεῖν* the verb *μισεῖν* has in later Greek the Genitive of the thing (Liban. Oratt. p. 120 d.; Cantacuz. I. 56).

c. to verbs signifying to *emit an odor* (*smell, breathe hard*), Mtth.

[1] How *κατηγορεῖν* (properly, maintain, assert *against one*) comes by the Genitive of a *person* (Matt. xii. 10; Luke xxiii. 2, etc.), is obvious; but *καταγινώσκειν τινός* 1 Jno. iii. 20 f. is construed exactly in the same manner (*Mtth.* 860). Instead of *ἐγκαλεῖν τινι* (Sir. xlvi. 19) we find in Rom. viii. 33 *ἐγκαλ. κατά τινος*, which is as easily accounted for as *κατηγορεῖν εἴς τινα Maetzner*, Antiph. 207.

856; for in ὄζειν τινός the Genitive denotes the substance *from* which the ὄζειν emanates. In the N. T. this Gen. occurs only in a
192 figurative sense, Acts ix. 1 ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου *panting with,*
7th ed. *breathing of, threatening and slaughter*, cf. Aristoph. eq. 437 οὗτος ἤδη κακίας καὶ συκοφαντίας πνεῖ Heliod. 1, 2; Ephraem. 2358. Different from this are φόνου πνέοντες Theocr. 22, 82, θυμὸν ἐκπνέων Eurip. Bacch. 620, where the direct object is expressed: *breathing murder, courage*, the verbs being used as transitive.

10. The Genitive appears to be removed a little farther from its original import, when joined

a. to verbs of *feeling*, in order to denote the object *towards which* the feeling is directed; as, σπλαγχνίζεσθαί τινος Matt. xviii. 27. But in German also, *sich jemandes erbarmen*, we find the Genitive construction; and in Greek the object was unquestionably conceived as operating upon the feeling subject, consequently, as the point *from* which the feeling proceeds, i.e. is generated. Most verbs of this kind, however, are construed with the Acc., conformably to a different conception of the relation; see § 32, 1 and Hartung, S. 20.

b. to verbs of *longing* and *desiring* (Mtth. 824 f.), where we commonly say, long *for* something, hanker *after*, etc. But the Greek conception of ἐπιθυμεῖν τινος (except in connections where the Gen. can be taken partitively, as ἐπιθυμ. σοφίας, to desire *of* wisdom) was such that the longing, the desire, proceeds from the good in question, — the good things *of themselves* entice men to longing. In the N. T. ἐπιθυμεῖν invariably (in Matt. v. 28 alone we find a var.) takes the Genitive; as, Acts xx. 33 ἀργυρίου
184 ἢ χρυσίου ἢ ἱματισμοῦ οὐδενὸς ἐπεθύμησα (1 Tim. iii. 1), so also
6th ed. ὀρέγεσθαι 1 Tim. iii. 1 εἴ τις ἐπισκοπῆς ὀρέγεται, καλοῦ ἔργου ἐπιθυμεῖ (Isocr. Demon. p. 24 ὀρεχθῆναι τῶν καλῶν ἔργων Lucian. Tim. 70), Heb. xi. 16, and ἱμείρεσθαι 1 Thess. ii. 8. Likewise in the Sept. and the Apocrypha (Wisd. vi. 12; 1 Macc. iv. 17; xi. 11, etc.) we find ἐπιθυμεῖν τινος the rule (ὀρέγεσθαι does not occur there at all), though the verb already begins to be joined as transitive to the Acc. Exod. xx. 17; Deut. v. 21; vii. 25; Mic. ii. 2; Job xxxiii. 20, cf. Wisd. xvi. 3; Ecclus. xvi. 1. The verb ἐπιποθεῖν appears constantly with the Acc. even in the earlier Greek (because the
218 construction was thus resolved in thought: ποθεῖν or πόθον ἔχειν ἐπί τι, *after* something, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 31), Plat. legg. 9, 855 c.; Diod. S. 17, 101; cf. 2 Cor. ix. 14; Phil. i. 8; 1 Pet. ii. 2. Likewise πεινῆν and διψῆν, which in Greek authors regularly take the

Genitive, are joined in the N. T. in a figurative sense (in reference to spiritual blessings) with the Acc. (φιλοσοφίαν διψ. Epist. Socr. 25 p. 53 Allat.) Matt. v. 6 πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες δικαιοσύνην.[1] The difference between these two constructions is obvious: διψ. φιλοσοφίας means *to have a thirst for philosophy*, while διψ. φιλοσοφίαν represents philosophy as something indivisible which 193
one wishes to get possession of. 7th ed.

Next to the verbs already mentioned follow, c. those of *thinking of*, *remembering* (Mtth. 820); as, Luke xvii. 32 μνημονεύετε τῆς γυναικὸς Λώτ, [1 Thess. i. 3], Luke i. 72 μνησθῆναι διαθήκης, Acts xi. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 2; Luke xxiii. 42; Heb. xiii. 2; Jude 17; 2 Pet. iii. 2 (also ὑπομιμνήσκειν τινὰ περί τινος 2 Pet. i. 12). We, too, say: *einer Sache gedenken*, think *of* a matter, for this process is simply the seizing, laying hold of, a particular with the memory. Correspondingly, in the case of *forgetting* a thing, Heb. xii. 5 ἐκλέλησθε τῆς παρακλήσεως, vi. 10 ἐπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν, xiii. 2, 16. But ἀναμιμνήσκεσθαι Heb. x. 32; 2 Cor. vii. 15; Mark xiv. 72 and μνημονεύειν Matt. xvi. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Rev. xviii. 5 often govern the Accusative (Mtth. 820), yet rather in the sense of *having present in the mind*, holding in remembrance (Bhdy. 177); ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι likewise is joined to this case in Phil. iii. 14, so sometimes in the Sept. (Deut. iv. 9; 2 Kings xvii. 38; Isa. lxv. 16; Wisd. ii. 4; Ecclus. iii. 14), and even in Attic (Mtth. 821). This double construction rests on a different view of the relation, of which there is a glimpse also in Latin. Verbs of *mentioning* do not take the Genitive in the N. T.; but we find, instead, μνημον. περί Heb. xi. 22 (cf. μιμνήσκεσθαι περί Xen. C. 1, 6, 12; Plut. paedag. 9, 27; Tob. iv. 1).

d. Further, the transition is easy to verbs of *caring for* or *neglecting* (Mtth. 821), Luke x. 34 ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ (1 Tim. iii. 5), 1 Cor. ix. 9 μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ; (Acts xviii. 17; Plut. paedag. 17, 22), Tit. iii. 8 ἵνα φροντίζωσι καλῶν ἔργων, 1 Tim. v. 8 τῶν ἰδίων οὐ προνοεῖ, 1 Tim. iv. 14 μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος (Heb. ii. 3), Heb. xii. 5 μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου. Under this head comes also φείδεσθαι (Mtth. 822),[2] Acts xx. 29 μὴ φειδόμενοι 185
τοῦ ποιμνίου *not sparing the flock*, 1 Cor. vii. 28; 2 Pet. ii. 4. etc. 6th ed.

[1] In the Sept. this verb is found with the Dat. Ex. xvii. 3 ἐδίψησεν ὁ λαὸς ὕδατι (*for* water). Likewise in Ps. lxii. 2 the Cod. Vat. has ἐδίψησέ σοι (θεῷ, al. σε) ἡ ψυχή μου.

[2] In Latin parcere *alicui*. But in the Greek φείδεσθαι, judging from the construction, lies rather the notion of restraining one's self *from*, sibi temperare etc. In the Sept., however, this verb also takes the Dative, and is construed with prepositions.

219 On the other hand, we find *μέλει* also with *περί* in Matt. xxii. 16; Jno. x. 13; xii. 6, etc. (Her. 6, 101; Xen. C. 4, 5, 17; Hiero, 9, 10, etc.; Wisd. xii. 13; 1 Macc. xiv. 43, cf. Strange in Jahn's Archiv II. 400).

e. Lastly, verbs of *ruling* (Mtth. 838) take the Genitive as the simple case of dependence (for to this the notion of *preceding* also reduces itself, Hartung, S. 14): Mark x. 42 *οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν* (Rom. xv. 12 LXX.), cf. also *κυριεύειν* Rom. xiv. 9; 2 Cor. i. 24, *αὐθεντεῖν* 1 Tim. ii. 12, *καταδυναστεύειν* Jas. ii. 6, *ἀνθυπατεύειν* Acts xviii. 12 etc. — verbs all derived from nouns, and whose construction is to be resolved thus: *κύριόν τινος εἶναι*, *ἀνθύπατόν τινος εἶναι*. On the other hand, *βασιλεύειν τινός*
194 (Her. 1, 206 and Sept.) never occurs in the N. T.; but we find
7th ed. instead, conformably to the Heb. idiom (בְּ with verbs of *ruling*, Ps. xlvii. 9; Prov. xxviii. 15; Neh. v. 15) *βασ. ἐπί τινος* Matt. ii. 22; Rev. v. 10, or *ἐπί τινα* Luke i. 33; xix. 14, 27; Rom. v. 14; cf. Lob. Phryn. 475.

Verbs of *buying* and *selling* take the Genitive of the *price* (Bhdy. 177 f. Mdv. 67 f.); as, Matt. x. 29 *οὐχὶ δύο στρουθία ἀσσαρίου πωλεῖται* — xxvi. 9 *ἠδύνατο τοῦτο πραθῆναι πολλοῦ*, xx. 13; Mark xiv. 5; Acts v. 8 (Plato apol. 20 b.) 1 Cor. vi. 20; cf. Rev. vi. 6 — Bar. i. 10; iii. 30 (but Matt. xxvii. 7 *ἠγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν* viz. *ἀργυρίων*, Acts i. 18), Acts vii. 16 *ὠνήσατο τιμῆς ἀργυρίου* (with *ἐκ* Palaeph. 46, 3, 4). Also under this head comes Jude 11 *τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ μισθοῦ ἐξεχύθησαν for reward* (Xen. C. 3, 2, 7; Plat. rep. 9, 575 b.). Agreeably to the construction with *ἐκ*, and still more in view of the fundamental import of the Genitive, this genitivus pretii might be reduced to the notion of *proceeding from* (cf. Eng. *proceeds*), as that which is bought for a price *comes* to us, as it were, *out of* the price given. But it is probably more correct to refer this construction to the Genitive of *exchanging*, and to compare such phraseology as *ἀλλάσσειν τί τινος* (Hartung, 15; Mtth. 483); for one buys or sells *in exchange for* so much money. Hence in Greek *ἀντί* [cf. Heb. xii. 2, 16] is the preposition of price. (A different view will be found in Hm. Opusc. I. 179; see on the other hand Prüfer de graeca et lat. declinat. 98 sq.) However, the construction *ἀλλάσσειν*, *διαλλάσσειν τί τινος* does not itself occur in the Greek Bible, but in Rom. i. 23 we find the more explicit *ἀλλάσσειν τι ἔν τινι*, as in the Sept. (after the Heb. חָמַר בְּ) Ps. cv. 20. Ἀλλάσσειν τί τινι comes nearest to this (Her. 7, 152; Sept. Exod. xiii. 13; Lev. xxvii. 10, and frequently). Moreover, words of *valuing*, *estimating*, etc. stand on the same footing with verbs of *buying*, etc., and govern in like manner the Genitive (Krü. 44); cf. *ἄξιος* Matt. iii. 8; x. 10; Rom. i. 32, *ἀξιοῦν* 2 Thess. i. 11; 1 Tim. v. 17; Heb. iii. 3, etc.

11. The Genitive of *place* and of *time* is employed without being directly governed by a single word, yet in accordance with the primary import of the case (Hm. Vig. 881; Hartung, 32 ff.) and in obvious connection with the structure of the sentence; as, Aesch. Prom. 714 λαιᾶς χειρὸς σιδηροτέκτονες οἰκοῦσι Χάλυβες *on the left hand* (Her. 5, 77), Xen. Eph. 5, 13 ἐκείνης τῆς ἡμέρας *that day*, Philostr. her. 9, 3 f. χειμῶνος *in winter*, 'of a winter,' Thuc. 3, 104 (Mtth. 857 f.). The N. T. writers, in this case, almost invariably employ a preposition. Only in certain standing phrases do they use the Genitive alone (which is strictly a partitive Genitive); as, often νυκτός *by night*, also μέσης νυκτός Matt. xxv. 6, ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός Luke xviii. 7; Acts ix. 24 (Xen. A. 2, 6, 7), χειμῶνος Matt. xxiv. 20 (joined with σαββάτῳ), Luke xxiv. 1 ὄρθρου βαθέος, v. 19 μὴ εὑρόντες, ποίας (ὁδοῦ) εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν (*by*) *what way*, xix. 4 (ἐκείνης sc. ὁδοῦ), Gal. vi. 17 τοῦ λοιποῦ (Thuc. 4. 98) cf. the German *des weitern*. (But for the very reason that the Genitive of time is confined in the N. T. to simple and current phrases, Acts i. 3 ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα in D must not be translated *within forty days* (Mtth. 858), see above 2, *a*. Had such been Luke's meaning, he would undoubtedly have employed a preposition.) 186 6th ed. 220 195 7th ed.

Rev. xvi. 7 ἤκουσα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος is certainly not to be referred to this head (*I heard speaking from the altar*, cf. Soph. El. 78; Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 142; Bttm. Philoct. 115; Bhdy. 137); but, in accordance with the analogous expressions in verse 5 and vi. 3, 5, it must be translated *I heard the altar speaking;* see Bengel in loc. This prosopopoeia may be attributed to the strangely mysterious character of these visions, see de Wette. The reading ἤκ. ἄλλου ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου λέγ. is a manifest correction. On Τιβεριάδος Jno. vi. 1 see above, p. 191.

Note. Genitives absolute, which often occur in the historical style even in the N. T., are not in their original application properly absolute, but come under the Genitive as the case defining time, cf. Hartung, S. 31 (hence they correspond to Ablatives absolute in Latin). Subsequently, however, they are used in a more extended reference, especially to specify the cause and condition (also involved in the Genitive). We have merely to remark here, that they sometimes occur where the nature of the verb following would lead one to expect a different oblique case: Luke xvii. 12 εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ... ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ, xxii. 10, 53; xviii. 40 ἐγγίσαντος αὐτοῦ ἐπερώτησεν αὐτόν, Mark xi. 27; Acts iv. 1; xxi. 17; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Jno. iv. 51. This is usual likewise in Greek authors, partly because at the beginning of the sentence the writer had not yet decided on the principal verb, and partly because the regular construction would often render the expression clumsy, cf. Her. 1, 41; Thuc. 1, 114;

221 3, 13; Xen. A. 2, 4, 24; Mem. 4, 8, 5; Pol. 4, 49, 1; Xen. Eph. 4, 5; Heliod. 2, 30, 113; Wyttenbach, Plut. Mor. II. 21; Schaef. Apollon. Rh. II. 171 and Dem. II. 202; Poppo, Thuc. I. 2, 119; Siebelis, Pausan. II. 8; Hoffmann, Pr. de casib. absol. p. 1.[1] Likewise 2 Cor. iv. 18 *αἰώνιον βάρος*
187 *δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα* might have
6th ed. been expressed thus: *μὴ σκοποῦσι τὰ βλεπ.* By the former construction, however, the participial clause is brought out with more prominence and force. Cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 37. Finally, Genitives absolute are exceptionally used when the subject of the principal clause (in the Nominative) is the same as that of the secondary clause; as, Matt. i. 18 *μνηστευθείσης τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ Μαρίας τῷ Ἰωσήφ, πρὶν ἢ συνελθεῖν αὐτούς, εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα,* where the writer probably had contemplated another termination of the sentence. So perhaps Rev. xvii. 8. In Greek authors *such* instances are rare; yet see Her. 5, 81; Plat. rep. 8, 547 b.; Pol. 31, 17, 1, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 119 sq.; Wannowski, p. 61 sqq. In the Sept. notice Gen. xliv. 4;
196 Exod. iv. 21; v. 20; xiv. 18; cf. Acta apocr. p. 68, 69; Epiphan. vit.
7th ed. p. 326, 340, 346 (in the 2d vol. of the Works of Epiphan. ed. Colon.); in Latin, Suet. Tib. 31. In all these instances Genitives absolute appear as fixed forms of expression, their grammatical origin being no longer taken into consideration.

§ 31. DATIVE.

In Greek the Dative is the more comprehensive in its import, because it represents the Ablative also, which in Latin is a separate case (cf. Hm. emend. rat. p. 140). Its relation to a sentence is not (in general) close and essential, like that of the Acc. or even the Gen.; but it serves merely to complete and extend, inasmuch as it points out the object (mostly a person) towards which an action tends, to which it has reference, yet on which it does not directly terminate. Hence the Dative frequently accompanies an Acc. of the object; as, 2 Cor. ix. 2 *προθυμία ἣν καυχῶμαι Μακεδόσιν,* Acts xxii. 25 *προέτειναν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἱμάσιν* (Kuin. in loc.), xxiv. 5; Jno. vi. 13. In a looser application (to things) the Dative denotes what in any way accompanies the action, as motive, power, circumstance (of time and place), etc.

222 1. We shall first consider the Dative as the case of reference (of the more remote object, as it is commonly called) when joined to transitive verbs — as, *διδόναι* (*δωρεῖσθαί*) *τί τινι, γράφειν τί τινι* (2 Cor. ii. 3), *εὐαγγελίζεσθαί τινί τι* (Luke ii. 10; 2 Cor. xi. 7),

[1] From the Latin compare Ablat. absol. in Cic. Phil. 11, 10; fam. 15, 4, 18; Caes b. gall. 5, 4; civ. 1, 36; 2, 19; 3, 21.

ὀφείλειν τινί τι Matt. xviii. 28; Rom. xiii. 8 (cf. Rom. i. 14; viii. 12, contrary xv. 27), ὁμοιοῦν τινά τινι Matt. vii. 24; xi. 16, καταλλάσσειν τινά τινι 2 Cor. v. 18, ἐγείρειν θλῖψιν τοῖς δεσμοῖς Phil. i. 17, all which present no difficulty,—and especially to intransitive verbs and their cognate adjectives.

Its force is more or less distinct,

a. In ἀκολουθεῖν, ἐγγίζειν, κολλᾶσθαί, στοιχεῖν (Rom. iv. 12 etc.), δεδέσθαι (Rom. vii. 2; 1 Cor. vii. 27), ἐντυγχάνειν τινί etc., also εὔχεσθαί τινι Acts xxvi. 29.

b. In μεριμνᾶν Matt. vi. 25, ὀργίζεσθαι v. 22, μετριοπαθεῖν τινι Heb. v. 2, in μέμφεσθαι Heb. viii. 8 (Krü. 21), φθονεῖν Gal. v. 26.

c. In πιστεύειν, πεποιθέναι, ἀπιστεῖν, ἀπειθεῖν, ὑπακούειν, ὑπήκοος, ἐναντίος, etc.

d. In προσκυνεῖν, λατρεύειν (not Phil. iii. 3), δουλοῦν.

e. In ἀρέσκειν, ἀρκεῖν Matt. xxv. 9; 2 Cor. xii. 9, ἀρκετός and ἱκανός Matt. vi. 34; 1 Pet. iv. 3; 2 Cor. ii. 6.

f. Further, in ξενίζεσθαί τινι 1 Pet. iv. 12 (Thuc. 4, 85) *be surprised at a thing* (the surprise being in reference to the thing), 188 6th ed
ἀπολογεῖσθαί (2 Cor. xii. 19; Acts xix. 33 cf. 1 Pet. iii. 15) and διαλέγεσθαί τινι (Acts xvii. 2; xviii. 19), διακατελέγχεσθαί τινι Acts xviii. 28 (δογματίζειν τινί cf. Col. ii. 20), where the person to whom the conversation, defence, etc. is addressed, is indicated by the Dative. Also ὁμολογεῖν and ἐξομολογεῖσθαί τινι (Jas. v. 16), even in the sense of *praise* (לְ הוֹדָה) Luke x. 21; Rom. xiv. 11; 197 7th ed
Heb. xiii. 15, since every act of praise to God is a confession made to him, that we recognize him as the High and Mighty One. So in one instance also αἰνεῖν τινι Rev. xix. 5 according to the best Codd. [Sin. too], cf. Ecclus. li. 12; in this case, too, לְ הוֹדָה was probably in mind,—unless the construction is ad sensum like εἰπεῖν αἴνεσιν.

g. In κρίνεσθαί Matt. v. 40, διακρίνεσθαί τινι Jude 9 (Jer. xv. 10) *to go to law, to contend with one.*

h. In verbs of *likeness* or *similarity*—under another point of view—Matt. xxiii. 27 ὁμοιάζετε τάφοις κεκονιαμένοις, vi. 8; Heb. ii. 17; 2 Cor. x. 12 cf. ὅμοιός, ἴσος τινί Matt. xi. 16; Jno. ix. 9; 1 Jno. iii. 2; Acts xiv. 15; Matt. xx. 12; Phil. ii. 6; cf. Fr. Arist. amic. p. 15 (ὅμοιος also once with the Genitive, Jno. viii. 55; Mtth. 873; cf. § 30, 4), and verbs of *participating in;* as, 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Pet. iv. 13 cf. Luke v. 10; Rom. xv. 27 (these verbs have more frequently the Gen. § 30, 8). Likewise ὁμιλεῖν τινι Acts xxiv. 26.

i. In verbs of *using*, as χρῆσθαι Acts xxvii. 17; 1 Cor. ix. 12, 15; 223

(on the contrary, once 1 Cor. vii. 31 with the Acc. in the best Codd. [also Sin.*], as sometimes in later writers e.g. Malal. p. 5; Theophan. p. 314; Böckh, corp. inscript. II. 405 — not Xen. Ages. 11, 11 — cf. Bornem. Act. p. 222. But in Acts xxvii. 17 the Acc. has little authority).

k. In στήκειν (ἑστηκέναι) τινί, *to stand fast* for a thing 2 Cor. i. 24; Gal. v. 1 (var.), or a person Rom. xiv. 4.

Προσκυνεῖν (*reverence* and *worship*) invariably governs the Dative in Matt. Mark and Paul (Matt. iv. 10 is a quotation from Deut. vi. 13); while in the other N. T. writers it has sometimes the Dat. (Jno. ix. 38; Acts vii. 43; Heb. i. 6; Rev. iv. 10; vii. 11; xiii. 4, etc.), sometimes the Acc. (Luke iv. 8; xxiv. 52; Jno. iv. 23; Rev. ix. 20; xiv. 11); similarly γονυπετεῖν τινα Mark (i. 40) x. 17; Matt. xvii. 14 (and λατρεύειν τινά sometimes, Mtth. 886). The Dative after προσκυνεῖν is peculiar to later Greek alone; Lob. Phryn. p. 463; cf. Bos, ex. phil. p. 1 sqq.; Kypke, obs. I. 7 sq.

Χαίρειν, which in Greek authors is often construed with the Dative (Fr. Rom. III. 78 f.), and sometimes also in the Sept. (Prov. xvii. 19, cf. Bar. iv. 37), is never so used in the N. T. (on Rom. xii. 12 see below, No. 7; in 1 Cor. xiii. 6 the Dat. depends on σύν) but for the most part with ἐπί *over*.

The phrases ἀποθανεῖν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, τῷ νόμῳ Rom. vi. 2; Gal. ii. 19, θανατοῦσθαι τῷ νόμῳ Rom. vii. 4, νεκρὸν εἶναι τῇ ἁμ. vi. 11, in antithesis to ζῆν τινι (τῷ θεῷ Rom. vi. 10 cf. 1 Pet. iv. 10) signify: *to be dead to* (for) *sin, the law* etc. cf. Rom. vii. 4 εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ and ἀπογενέσθαι τῇ ἁμαρτ. 1 Pet. ii. 24. In the same way, in Rom. vi. 20 ἐλεύθεροι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ is contrasted with δουλοῦσθαι τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ (verse 18 cf. 19, 20): *when ye were slaves to sin, ye were free to* (relatively to) *righteousness*, — so far as righteousness is concerned, freemen.

189 6th ed. 198 7th ed. In κατακρίνειν τινὰ θανάτῳ Matt. xx. 18 (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 6),[1] an expression unknown to classic Greek, we find a Dative of the thing after a verb of sentencing: *to condemn one to death*, i.e. by sentence adjudge to death. The classical Greek construction is κατακρίνειν τινὰ θανάτου or θάνατον (Mtth. 850; Heupel, Mr. 285), or κατακρ. τινὶ θάνατον Her. 6, 85 (to award death). Analogous is καταδικάζειν τινὰ θανάτῳ, Lob. Phryn. p. 475; cf. also ἔνοχος τῇ κρίσει Matt. v. 21 f. *amenable to the court* (§ 30, 8). Cf. Bleek, Heb. II. I. 340.

2. Closely connected with this is the Dative dependent on εἶναι (ὑπάρχειν) and γίνεσθαι (not on the predicates joined to them); 224 for ἐστί or γίνεταί μοι φόβος can only mean: the φόβον εἶναι or γίνεσθαι applies, refers, to me. From it result the following uses:

[1] This construction is unknown also in the O. T. Of the parallel passages quoted by *Bretsch.* one, Sus. 41, is κατέκριναν αὐτὴν ἀποθανεῖν, and the other, vs. 48, is absol. κατεκρίνατε θυγατέρα Ἰσραήλ.

a. Without a predicate, *εἶναί τινι* expresses property (possession), *γίνεσθαί τινι* impartation: Luke ii. 7 *οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τόπος they had no room*, Acts viii. 21; x. 6; iii. 6; xxi. 23; Matt. xviii. 12; Luke i. 14 *ἔσται χαρά σοι*, Matt. xvi. 22 *οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο this will not befall thee*, Acts xx. 3, 16; ii. 43 *ἐγένετο πάσῃ ψυχῇ φόβος fear fell upon*, Rom. xi. 25. Elliptically 1 Cor. vi. 13; v. 12; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Jno. ii. 4 (Krü. 59).

b. With a predicate (mostly a substantive), *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαί τινι* denotes what quality *for a person* a thing has or receives, objectively as well as subjectively (i.e. in his own opinion); as, 1 Cor. viii. 9 *μήπως ἡ ἐξουσία ... πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν*, i. 18 *ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστίν* etc. ix. 2; xiv. 22; Rom. ii. 14; vii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 3; ix. 3; Phil. i. 28. But *become* (redound) *to* (Krü. 59) is usually expressed in the N. T. by *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι εἴς τι*.

3. *Substantives* derived from verbs governing a Dative sometimes take the same case, instead of the ordinary Genitive; as, 2 Cor. ix. 12 *εὐχαριστίαι τῷ θεῷ* (not 11), somewhat like *εὐχαὶ τοῖς θεοῖς* Plat. legg. 7, 800 a., see Wyttenbach, Plut. Mor. I. 154 Lips.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. 101, and rep. I. 372; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. 374; Fr. Mr. p. 63. Compare besides *τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ* Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2 (Plat. legg. 658 e. *τὸ ἦθος ἡμῖν*) and *τὸ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ* 1 Cor. vii. 35. The case is different in Luke vii. 12 *υἱὸς μονογενὴς τῇ μητρί a son who was to his mother an only son* (thus not strictly for the Genitive, cf. Tob. iii. 15 *μονογενὴς τῷ πατρί*, Judg. xi. 34), with which the Dative of relationship — cf. Luke v. 10; Rom. iv. 12 (Bttm. Philoct. p. 102 sq.; Boisson. Nic. p. 271; Ast, Plat. Polit. 451, 519, also legg. p. 9) — is not to be confounded. On Rom. iv. 12 see § 61, 5, p. 555.

Also in Matt. xxvii. 7 *ἠγόρασαν τὸν ἀγρὸν ... εἰς ταφὴν τοῖς ξένοις for a burying-ground for strangers*, the Dative belongs to the substantive; cf. Strabo 17, 807 *πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν τοῖς ξένοις*. See Schoem. Isae. p. 264; Krü. 68 f. But in 1 Cor. vii. 28 the Dative may be referred to the verb of the sentence. Yet see Bhdy. S. 88. 199 5th ed. 190 6th ed

4. The Dative, without being directly involved in the signification of a verb or noun, expresses the relation of the action to some one: 2 Cor. ii. 12 *οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου for my spirit* (1 Cor. vii. 28), or Luke xviii. 31 *πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ... τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου which were written for him* (that they might receive fulfilment in him), (Matt. xiii. 14; Jude 14). Cf. besides, Matt. xiii. 52; Phil. i. 27; 1 Tim. i. 9; Rev. xxi. 2. Especially deserving of notice are, 225

a. The Dative of *opinion* or *decision* (cf. above, No. 2); as, Plato, Phaed. 101 d. εἴ σοι ἀλλήλοις ξυμφωνεῖ ἢ διαφωνεῖ; Soph. Oed. C. 1446. So in the expressions Acts vii. 20 ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ, 2 Cor. x. 4 δυνατὰ τῷ θεῷ.[1] See also 1 Cor. ix. 2. Cf. Wyttenb. Plat. Phaed. as above; Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 615; Krü. 61.

b. The Dative of *interest*, 2 Cor. v. 13 εἴτε ἐξέστημεν, θεῷ· εἴτε σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν (Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 22), or, more definitely, the dativus commodi and incommodi, Jno. iii. 26 ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας, *to whom*, in favor of whom (Luke iv. 22; Rom. x. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; cf. Xen. M. 1, 2, 21). On the other hand, Matt. xxiii. 31 μαρτυρεῖτε ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι υἱοί ἐστε etc., *against* yourselves, cf. Jas. v. 3. Cf. besides, Heb. vi. 6; Jude 1; Rom. xiii. 2. On Rev. viii. 3, see Ewald. (But Eph. v. 19 λαλοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς — ἀλλήλοις — ψαλμοῖς, etc., is a simple Dative of direction: *speaking to one another*, etc.)

5. The preceding illustrations suffice to show that the Dative is as closely related to the prepositions εἰς (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 360)[2] and πρός (cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 558), as the Gen. is to the prepositions ἐκ and ἀπο. Hence in many phrases one of the former prepositions is used instead of the Dative. Thus we find, as every one knows, not only λέγειν τινί and πρός τινα (the latter is in Matt. and Mark the usual indeed almost invariable expression, see Schulz, Parab. v. Verwalt. S. 38) — cf. κράζειν τινί Rev. vii. 2; xiv. 15, φωνεῖν τινι Rev. xiv. 18, — but also εὔχεσθαι θεῷ Acts xxvi. 29 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 12; Demosth. Conon. 729 c.; Plut. Coriol. 9; Xen. Eph. 4, 3), and εὔχεσθαι πρὸς θεόν 2 Cor. xiii. 7 (Xen. M. 1, 3, 2) cf. Phil. iv. 6, βοᾶν τινι Luke xviii. 7 and β. πρός τινα Hos. vii. 14, ψεύδεσθαί τινι (Acts v. 4; Ps. xvii. 45; lxxvii. 36; Jer. v. 12, but not in Greek authors) and ψεύδ. πρός τινα (*to lie against one, to be false towards one*) Xen. A. 1, 3, 5, καταλλάττειν τινί and
200 πρός τινα Xen. vectig. 6, 8; Joseph. antt. 14, 11, 3,[3] εὐδοκεῖν εἴς τινα
7th ed. 2 Pet. i. 17 and τινί in Greek writers (Pol. 4, 22, 7; 1 Macc. i. 43),
226 μάχεσθαί τινι Xen. A. 4, 5, 12; Plato, rep. 3, 407 a. and πρός τινα Jno. vi. 52; Iliad. 17, 98; Plato, Lach. 191 d.; Lucian. conv. 42, and often (also in Sept.),[4] ὁμιλεῖν τινι and πρός τινα Luke xxiv. 14;

[1] Τοὺς πτωχοὺς τῷ κόσμῳ, as *Lchm.* and *Tdf.* read Jas. ii. 5, would be similar.

[2] In modern Greek the Acc. with εἰς serves very commonly as a circumlocution for the Dative, even in its simplest relations; as, λέγω εἰς τὸν φίλον μου *dico amico meo*, (German, gegen m. Fr.), see *v. Lüdemann*, Lehrb. 90.

[3] Col. i. 20 ἀποκαταλλ. εἰς would be analogous, if this were not designedly a pregnant construction; see *Mey.*

[4] So besides παραβάλλειν τί τινι (Her. 4. 198) also τι πρός τι occurs (Joseph. Ap. 2. 15). Otherwise Mark iv. 30 ἐν ποίᾳ παραβολῇ παραβάλωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, see *Fr.* but the reading here varies.

Xen. M. 4, 3, 2. The construction with a preposition doubtless 191
attracted the N. T. writers, through the influence of the explicit 6th ed.
and graphic idiom of their vernacular tongue, and hence where the Dat. commodi or incommodi would have been sufficient for native Greek authors, we find εἰς: Acts xxiv. 17 ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου, Luke vii. 30 τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτούς *to their own harm* (so that εἰς also signifies *contra*).[1] On the other hand κηρύττειν or εὐαγγελίζεσθαι εἰς, being constantly followed by the Plural of the noun, denotes *to make known among*, Mark xiii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 25; Luke xxiv. 47 (Paus. 8, 5, 8). In Matt. xx. 1 μισθοῦσθαι εἰς τὸν ἀμπελῶνα means hire, not *for*, but *into* his vineyard. In the same way, the construction is pregnant in Mark viii. 19 τοὺς ἄρτους ἔκλασα εἰς τοὺς πεντακισχιλ. *broke* (and divided) *among* the etc. Likewise in Matt. v. 22 ἔνοχος εἰς τὴν γέενναν *liable into Gehenna*, i.e. to go, be cast (on the other hand τῇ κρίσει, τῷ συνεδρίῳ). Also Rom. viii. 18 τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς is an abridged expression (see Fr.) similar to the Hebrew נִגְלָה אֶל־ 1 Sam. iii. 7. Lastly, in the phrases ὠφέλιμος πρός τι 1 Tim. iv. 8; 2 Tim. iii. 16 (with εἰς Xen. Oec. 5, 11 cf. χρήσιμος εἰς Wisd. xiii. 11), εὔθετος εἴς τι Luke xiv. 35 (Dion. H. de Thuc. 55, 3, with πρός Pol. 26, 5, 6; D. S. 5, 37) the preposition with the Acc. must not be regarded as put for the Dative, since *useful, adapted, for, to something* is quite an appropriate expression, while the Dative would be more suitable in reference to the Person. Yet cf. Luke ix. 62 var.

The phrase πιστεύειν εἴς or ἐπί τινα (Acts ix. 42; xxii. 19) obviously means in Christian phraseology more than πιστεύειν τινί (credere, confidere alicui), and is to be taken as pregnant: in faith to resign one's self *unto* any one, to profess one's self a believer *on* one, fide se ad aliquem applicare.[2] Likewise παραδιδόναι εἰς (to deliver up *to* any one) is not simply equivalent 227
to παρ. τινί, but rather denotes deliver into the power of, surrender to, Matt. 201
x. 17; hence it is used with θάνατος Matt. x. 21; 2 Cor. iv. 11, θλῖψις Matt. 7th ed.
xxiv. 9, ἀκαθαρσία Rom. i. 24 etc.; cf. Xen. Hel. 1, 7, 3. The construction ἑαυτοὺς παρέδωκαν τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ εἰς ἐργασίαν ἀκαθαρσίας πάσης etc. Eph. iv. 19 requires no explanation.

[1] In Luke viii. 43 the text. rec. has εἰς ἰατροὺς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον, but the best Codd. [Sin. too] have ἰατροῖς. The latter must be preferred, as the former appears to be a correction. In Greek authors, that is to say, the verb is usually construed with εἰς, Xen. Cyrop. 2, 4, 9; Aelian. 14, 32.

[2] Πιστεύειν ἐν Χριστῷ is to be understood in the same way, yet this expression cannot be unquestionably established from Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 13; we find, however, in Mark i. 15 πιστ. ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, which is not essentially different. Further, ἡ πρός τινα πίστις, and the like (*Schwarz*, Comment. p. 1102), do not prove the expression πιστεύειν πρός or εἰς τινα to be pure Greek.

Note. The Dat. is related also to μετά. Accordingly, in the N. T. we find πολεμεῖν μετά τινος Rev. xii. 7 ; xiii. 4 for πολεμεῖν τινι, also κρίνεσθαι μετά τινος 1 Cor. vi. 6 (7). In other relations a circumlocution for the Dat. is
192 formed, a. By means of ἐνώπιον Acts vi. 5 ἤρεσεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους
6th ed. (Gen. xxxiv. 18 ; xli. 37 ; 2 Sam. iii. 36, etc.) cf. 1 Jno. iii. 22, προσκυνεῖν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke iv. 7 ; Rev. xv. 4). This, and almost the preposition ἐνώπιον itself (לִפְנֵי), is Hebraistic. b. After πέποιθα by ἐν Phil. iii. 3, or ἐπί with Dat. Mark x. 24; 2 Cor. i. 9 and with Acc. Matt. xxvii. 43 (1 Macc. x. 77), [or lastly by εἰς, yet only in Gal. v. 10]. c. After ἀκολουθεῖν by ὀπίσω Matt. x. 38 ; see § 33.

That the Dative can be employed precisely for the local πρός or εἰς with the Acc. has been denied by Bornem. (in Rosenm. Repertor. II. 253 and in the neu. krit. Journ. d. theol. Literat. VI. 146 f., cf. also ad Anab. p. 23), and also by Mey. on Acts ii. 33. It is true, the examples adduced from Greek poets by Fr. (Conject. I. 42) do not establish the rule (for prose), and the N. T. passages may be explained differently : in Acts ii. 33 and v. 31 ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ *may* signify *by (his) right hand ;* in Rev. ii. 16 σοι is simply a Dat. incommodi ; even Acts xxi. 16 might be rendered (after Beza and Glass.) *adducentes secum, apud quem hospitaremur Mnasonem*, so that Μνάσωνι dependent on ἄγοντες as Acc. of the object (Μνάσωνα κ.τ.λ.) would be incorporated into the relative clause. But the latter rendering has little probability.[1] Sooner could we, according to Bornem.'s more recent suggestion (Luke p. 177 sq.), resolve the attraction in the above passage thus: ἄγοντες (ἡμᾶς)
228 παρὰ Μνάσωνά τινα . . . παρ' ᾧ ξενισθῶμεν (as to ἄγειν παρά τινα cf. Her. 1, 86 ; 3, 15) ; even this, however, is not the easiest way. The construction ἄγειν τινί *bring to one* may indeed be unusual (yet see the Note) in Attic prose, but in later prose authors we find expressions entirely similar, as φοιτᾶν τινι Philostr. Soph. 2, 1, 14 (Wyttenbach, Plutarch. Mor. IV. 339), ἥκειν τινί Plutarch.
202 Aem. 16, 1, εἰσφέρειν τινά τινι Malal. 10, p. 231. On Acts xxi. 16
7th ed. especially, however, cf. Xen. Eph. 3, 6, p. 63 πότερον ἠγόμην Ἀβρο-

[1] Not precisely on account of the annexed predicate ἀρχ. μαθητῇ (*Bengel's* n. Archiv III. 175), as that refers to Mnason to show that Paul could trust him perfectly ; but rather because it is not credible that his companions would have brought a host for Paul with them from Caesarea, as there were in Jerusalem so many trustworthy Christians. According to this view one would have to assume that this Mnason was either accidentally present in Caesarea, or that he had a residence in two places at the same time. By dropping *secum*, which is not implied in ἄγοντες, the statement would become simpler: they brought (introduced) Mnason *in Jerusalem* after their arrival ; but then the position of the words would not be suitable.

κόμῃ, and Epiph. vit. p. 340 d. ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν Ἀθανασίῳ τῷ πάππᾳ.[1] See also Bhdy. 95; Held, Plut. Aem. P. p. 200. Hence ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ may without hesitation be translated: *raise* to *the right hand;* cf. vs. 34 (of Acts ii.) κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου; cf. Lucian. asin. 39.

In Luke ii. 41 ἐπορεύοντο ... εἰς Ἱερ. τῇ ἑορτῇ is not *to the festival* (Luth. *auf das Osterfest*), but either *on account of the f.* (see below, 6 c.), or, as a loose expression, *at the f.* (as we also say: they made a yearly journey *at Easter* to ... to attend divine service). There would be more reason for referring to the preceding rule Mark xiv. 53 συνέρχονται αὐτῷ *convenerant* eum, and Jno. xi. 33 τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους (Fr. Mr. 648). Still, as appears to me, in both these passages the Dative is really governed by σύν: the second signifying simply, who had come *with her:* and the first, *they came with him*, that is, with Jesus (verse 54), see BCrus. 193 (6th ed.)

Further, different from the foregoing construction is that of the Dative joined to verbs of *coming* in an ideal sense; as, Acts xxi. 31 ἀνέβη φάσις τῷ χιλιάρχῳ compare our *tidings came to him.* A similar usage occurs frequently and indisputably in Greek authors; as, Plutarch. Brut. 27 μέλλοντι αὐτῷ διαβαίνειν ... ἦκεν ἀγγελία περὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς, and Pomp. 13 τῷ Σύλλᾳ πρώτη μὲν ἦλθεν ἀγγελία. Cf. ἀνάγειν τί τινι to bring a thing before one (notify to), Malal. 3 p. 63; 10 p. 254.

6. In a wider use the Dative of the thing is employed of every thing *in reference to which* an action or a state comes to pass. Accordingly, it is used

a. To designate the sphere to which a general predicate is to be conceived as confined (cf. Bhdy. 84; Krü. 74); as, 1 Cor. xiv. 20 μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε children *in understanding*, children *in reference to malice* (Plat. Alcib. pr. 122 c.), Rom. iv. 20 ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει *he grew strong in faith*, 229 Phil. ii. 8 σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος, iii. 5; Matt. v. [3] 8; xi. 29; Acts vii. 51; xiv. 8; xvi. 5; xviii. 2; xx. 22; Rev. iv. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 34; Heb. v. 11; xi. 12; xii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18; v. 9 (Pol. 20, 4, 7); Gal. i. 22; Rom. xii. 10 f.; Col. ii. 5; Eph. iv. 18, 23 (Mtth. 898; Fr. Rom. III. 68). Such a Dat. is intercalated in Eph. ii. 3 ἦμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς as respects nature, naturally, children of wrath.

b. Of the rule, or standard, *according to* which something takes place; as, Acts xv. 1 ἐὰν μὴ περιτέμνησθε τῷ ἔθει Μωϋσέως (on the other hand, xvii. 2 κατὰ τὸ εἰωθός, and more frequently κατὰ

[1] Yet ἄγειν τινί (cf. προσάγειν τινί § 52, 4, 14.) is not in all these cases used in a purely local or material sense; but rather means *introduce to one's acquaintance.* Similarly φοιτᾶν τινι (*to attend one as teacher*), different from φοιτᾶν πρός τ. Epict. ench. 33, 13.

ἔθος) cf. Xen. C. 1, 2, 4; Sext. Emp. 2, 6; Strabo 15, 715 (Tob. iii. 8; 2 Macc. vi. 1).

c. Of the occasion or cause (*on account of*); as, Rom. xi. 20 τῇ
203 ἀπιστίᾳ ἐξεκλάσθησαν *because of unbelief* (cf. 30 ἠλεήθητε τῇ τού-
7th ed. των ἀπειθείᾳ), Gal. vi. 12; Col. i. 21 — also of the motive (*through*, *from*, etc.) 1 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσι, 2 Cor. i. 15; Rom. iv. 20. See Diog. L. 2, 57; Heliod. 1, 12, 33; Paus. 3, 7, 3; Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 1; cf. Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 392; Goeller, Thuc. p. 157, 184, etc.; Mtth. 894 f.; Bhdy. 102 f.; Krü. 73.

The use of the Dative in Rev. viii. 4 ἀνέβη ὁ καπνὸς τῶν θυμιαμάτων ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων, etc. is more strange, and has given rise to numerous conjectures. The simplest translation probably is: *there went up the smoke of the incense* (of the angels) *for the prayers*, i.e. the ascend-
194 ing smoke availed for the prayers, to attend and render them more accept-
6th ed. able (on the representation see Ewald in loc.). Expositors who supplied σύν took the same view of the expression. On the other hand the rendering *inter preces sanctorum* is by no means justifiable. In 2 Cor. vii. 11 the Dat. τῷ πράγματι is certainly allowable, yet harsh for the language of the N.T.; ἐν τῷ πράγματι has good authorities in its favor, and the ἐν was probably omitted, either because it was absorbed by the εἶναι or because ἐν παντὶ ... was taken with πράγματι.

7. In the uses adduced under 6. the Dative of *direction*, and consequently (according to Greek views) the Dative proper, is still to be detected more or less clearly; but this case, by a further outward extension of its import to whatever accompanies the action, passes over altogether into the Ablative,

d. When it designates the *mode* and *manner*, as casus modalis (Bhdy. 100 f.), 1 Cor. xi. 5 προσευχομένη ἀκατακαλύπτῳ τῇ κεφαλῇ *with the head uncovered*, x. 30; Col. ii. 11; Phil. i. 18; 2 Pet. ii. 4 (Jude 6), also Rom. viii. 24 τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν (and Eph. v. 19); — or the *instrument* (casus instrumentalis Mdv. 45, yet cf. Krü. 72), as 1 Pet. i. 18 οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε, Gal. ii. 13 ὥστε ... συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει (2 Pet. iii. 17 cf. Zosim. 5, 6), Eph. i. 13; Col. ii. 7; Phil. iii. 3; 1 Cor. ix. 7 τίς στρατεύεται
230 ἰδίοις ὀψωνίοις ποτέ *with his own resources*, at his own expense, Heb. vi. 17 ἐμεσίτευσεν ὅρκῳ, i. 3; Rom. xv. 18, — likewise Acts i. 5 ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι (xi. 16), Jno. xxi. 8 τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον, Mark vi. 32 (though elsewhere we find ἐν πλοίῳ, Matt. xiv. 13; Acts xxviii. 11; D. S. 19, 54), Acts xii. 2; Rom. i. 20; iii. 24; Tit. iii. 7; Eph. v. 19, etc. To this head may also be referred Heb. xii. 18 ὄρος κεκαυ-

μένον πυρί igni ardens, *burning in*, with, *fire*, (Exod. iii. 2; Deut iv. 11; ix. 15; cf. Lob. Paralip. p. 523 sq.). In Rom. xii. 12 τῇ ἐλπίδι χαίροντες is *through* (in) *hope* rejoicing. In reference to δεήσει in 2 Cor. ix. 14 I now agree with Mey. We often find ἐν or διά (especially of persons) used for the instrumental Dative; as, Rom. xv. 18; 2 Cor. xi. 23, 26 f.

A virtual Ablative will be perceived also in μεθύσκεσθαι οἴνῳ Eph. v. 18 (Prov. iv. 17), and in πληροῦσθαί τινι Rom. i. 29; 2 Cor. vii. 4 (Eurip. Herc. fur. 372, cf. πλήρης τινί Eurip. Bacch. 18 — oftener with the Gen. — Bhdy. 168, in later writers πλησθέντες ἀγνοίᾳ Malal. p. 54). (But in Eph. iii. 19 εἰς with the Acc. is not used for the Ablative. The preposition expresses rather: *filled up to the fulness*, etc.) 204 7th ed.

8. In all these (6 a. et seq.) relations, however, prepositions are not rarely and sometimes even more usually employed, — both in Greek prose, and still more in N. T. Greek, — with or without a modification of the meaning; viz.

For a. ἐν, 1 Pet. iv. 1 ἐν σαρκὶ παθών in connection with σαρκὶ παθ., Tit. i. 13 cf. ii. 2; διαφέρειν ἔν τινι 1 Cor. xv. 41 (Soph. Oed. C. 1112; Dion. H. ep. p. 225. Krü.).

For b. κατά, as almost always κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, εἰωθός Luke iv. 16; Acts xvii. 2.

For c. διά with the Acc. see § 49 c. p. 398 sq.

For d. διά or ἐν also μετά. Thus we find instead of βαπτίζεσθαι ὕδατι usually ἐν ὕδατι (*in* water) Matt. iii. 11; Jno. i. 26, 31 (but also ἐν πνεύματι), for βίᾳ always μετὰ βίας Acts v. 26; xxiv. 7; for πίστει also διὰ πίστεως, etc. But in Eph. ii. 8 τῇ χάριτι ἐστε σεσωσμένοι διὰ τῆς πίστεως and Rom. iii. 24 the Dat. expresses the motive, διὰ πίστ. the subjective means; and in 2 Pet. iii. 5 διὰ refers to the material means, the Dat. to the immaterial. For παντὶ τρόπῳ Phil. i. 18 we find ἐν παντὶ τρόπῳ 2 Thess. iii. 16. On the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 3 the Dat. is used of the means, and ἐν denotes the state (the disposition).

When, however, N. T. expositors took ἐν simply for a nota dativi (cf. Blomfield, Aeschyl. Agam. 1425, and Eurip. Med. p. 628), even where a Dative proper (not an Ablative) is required, they went too far, and their opinion could not find even a remote support in the Hebrew idiom. Most of the passages quoted are plausible only because in such connection elsewhere the Dative of a person is commonly employed (cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 11; iii. 1; i. 18), but in reality they are quite irrelevant. In Acts iv. 12 δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις is most certainly: *given* (promulged) *among* men, 195 6th ed. 231

cf. 2 Cor. viii. 1;[1] Gal. i. 16 ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί *to reveal his son in me* (ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου); 1 Jno. iv. 9 ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, the love of God was manifested *in* (respect to, *on*) *us* which differs unquestionably from *to us;* 1 Cor. xiv. 11 ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ βάρβαρος *according to me, in my estimation* (meo judicio, cf. Jacobs, Athen. p. 183; Döderlein, Oed. Col. p. 529; Wex, Soph. Antig. v. 549); 1 Cor. ii. 6 σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις means: *among* or *with, before,* (*coram* see Plat. symp. 175 e., frequently in the orators § 48 a.) *them that are perfect,* etc. (i.e. when we have to deal with such) cf. Judith vi. 2. Baumgarten has in the main correctly explained 2 Cor. iv. 3 ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἐστὶ κεκα-
205 λυμμένον: *is hid in* (*among, with*) *them that perish.* On ὁμολογεῖν ἔν τινι
7th ed. see § 32, 3 b. Acts xiii. 15 and Col. ii. 13 require no explanation, and Eph. ii. 5 νεκροὺς τοῖς παραπτώμασι is not grammatically parallel to the last passage. In Eph. i. 20 ἐνήργησεν ἐν Χριστῷ is quite regular: (*power*) *which he exhibited in Christ* (by raising him from the dead). Matt. xvii. 12 ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἠθέλησαν (Mark ix. 13 ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ) is: *they did, perpetrated on him,* cf. Mark xiv. 6; Jno. xiv. 30; Luke xxiii. 31; 1 Cor. ix. 15 (Gen. xl. 14; Judith vii. 24). Likewise correct is the expression 2 Cor. x. 12 μετρεῖν ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἑαυτοῖς: measuring *themselves on* (with) *themselves,* though in Greek authors the Dative alone is in use, Aristot. rhet. 2, 12; Herod. 1, 6, 2.

9. *Time,* as that substratum with which all events are connected, is expressed by the Dative in answer to the question *When;* whether it denotes,

a. A space of time; as, Luke viii. 29 πολλοῖς χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν *within* (*during*) a long time, Acts viii. 11; xiii. 20; Rom. xvi. 25; Jno. ii. 20 (not Eph. iii. 5); cf. Joseph. antt. 1, 3, 5 τὸ ὕδωρ ἡμέραις τεσσαράκοντα ὅλαις κατεφέρετο, Soph. Trach. 599 μακρῷ χρόνῳ, Aeschin. ep. 1. p. 121 c.; Diod. S. 19, 93.

b. Or (more frequently) a point of time, *at* which something takes place;—and that, too, in words that directly signify the notion of time or a division of time (with a numeral or Genitive annexed,
196 Krü. 57), as Luke xii. 20 ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί, Mark vi. 21 Ἡρῴδης τοῖς
6th ed. γενεσίοις αὐτοῦ δεῖπνον ἐποίησε, Matt. [xiv. 6 γενεσίοις γενομένοις according to Lachmann's reading, sustained also by Cod. Sinait.] xx. 19 τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀναστήσεται, xxvi. 17; Luke xiii. 16; Acts
232 vii. 8; xii. 21; xxi. 26; xxii. 13; xxvii. 23, or in names of festivals (Wannowski, p. 86) Luke xiii. 14 τῷ σαββάτῳ ἐθεράπευσε (xiv. 1), Matt. xii. 1 τοῖς σάββασι etc. Cf. Plat. conv. 174 a.; Mdv. 48.

[1] So also in Diog. L. 1, 105 τί ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθόν τε καὶ φαῦλον, where, too, the Latin translator has: *quidnam esset hominibus bonum* etc. Cf. besides, *Fabric* Pseudepigr. I. 628 δουλεύσουσιν ἐν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτῶν, Arrian. Epict. 1, 18, 8.

Yet ἐν is inserted, regularly in the last case, and frequently also in the first (especially with ἐσχάτη ἡμέρα or ἡμέρα τῆς κρίσεως), even in Luke (iii. 1; i. 26), cf. Krü. 57; the expression τῇ ἑορτῇ or ταῖς ἑορταῖς without ἐν is rare even in Greek authors (Wannowski, 88).

The Dative of *place* is not deeply rooted in the N. T. Before names of cities ἐν is always put; as, ἐν Ῥώμῃ, ἐν Τύρῳ Acts xvii. 6; xix. 1; Rom. i. 7; 2 Tim. i. 17; iv. 20, etc. But ὁδός occasionally dispenses with the preposition; as, Jas. ii. 25 ἑτέρᾳ ὁδῷ ἐκβαλοῦσα (where, however, the prepos. was hardly necessary) cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 16, ὁδῷ πορεύεσθαι Jude vs. 11; Acts xiv. 16 (trop.) cf. Lucian. Tim. 5 ὁδῷ βαδίζειν (Fr. Rom. III. 140 sq.), στοιχεῖν τοῖς ἴχνεσι Rom. iv. 12 (βαίνειν ἴχνεσι Plut. Sol. 30), with which are to be classed also the figurative expressions πορ. τῷ φόβῳ Acts ix. 31; xiv. 16; Prov. xxviii. 26; 2 Sam. xv. 11; 1 Macc. vi. 23; Bar. i. 18; ii. 10; iv. 13; Tob. i. 2; iv. 5 (interchangeably with πορ. ἐν 1 Pet. iv. 3, etc.) and even περιπατεῖν τοῖς ἔθεσι Acts xxi. 21; 2 Cor. xii. 18, Gal. v. 16; Rom. xiii. 13. Generally, even in Greek prose, the use of the Dativus localis is very limited; see Mdv. 48; Poppo, Thuc. 1, 143. 206 7th ed.

10. The Dative (of a person) with Passives instead of ὑπό, παρά, etc. with the Gen., is but seldom employed (and then usually with the Perfect): Luke xxiii. 15 οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶ πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ (Isocr. paneg. c. 18). Yet this construction is not entirely the same as that with ὑπό etc.; it denotes the person not by whom something has been done, but to whom what has been done belongs (Mdv. 45; Krü. 72; Benseler, Isocr. Evag. p. 13). It is used in particular with εὑρίσκεσθαι 2 Cor. xii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Rom. x. 20 Sept.; cf. besides Luke xxiv. 35 (Jas. iii. 18) Phil. iv. 5 (Acts xxiv. 14), also 2 Pet. ii. 19 where ᾧ τις ἥττηται means, *by what a man is overcome*, to what he is inferior, (in classic Greek ἡττᾶσθαί τινος). But in Acts xvi. 9 ὤφθη ὅραμα τῷ Παύλῳ means *became visible to him* (as often elsewhere ὀφθῆναί τινι *appear to one*). In Jas. iii. 7 τῇ φύσει τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ means rather *by the nature of man* (ingeniis hominum). In general, the Dative of a thing with Passives (probably also in Rom. xii. 16, see Fr. in loc.) is less surprising, as it coincides with the Dative of the means. In Heb. iv. 2 τοῖς ἀκούσασιν indicates probably the persons *with* or *in* whom the μὴ συγκρ. τῇ πίστει occurred. Lastly, Matt. v. 21 ff. ἐρρήθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις should be translated: *to them* of old time; see Tholuck, Bergpr. 158 f. The above use of the Dative (of a pers.) after Passives is known likewise in Greek prose, but it is especially frequent after participles; cf. Dem. Olynth. 3, p. 12 c.; 233

Theocrin. 507 c.; coron. 324 a.; Conon. 731 b.; Diog. L. 8, 6; Philostr. her. 4, 2.

Note 1. The Dative in Col. ii. 14 ἐξαλείψας τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον τοῖς δόγμασι, is noticeable. Some expositors explain it ὃ ἦν ἐν τοῖς δόγμασιν quod constabat placitis (mos.), conformably to Eph. ii. 15 τὸν νόμον τῶν
197 ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι καταργήσας — an explanation correct doubtless as re-
6th ed. spects the sense, but at variance with the grammar; for according to it Paul must have written: χειρόγρ. τὸ ἐν τοῖς δόγμασι. Now in the first place as regards Eph. ii. 15 the expression τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι must undoubtedly be taken as *one* idea: *commandments in* (individual) *ordinances*, cf. § 20, 2. And in Col., all things considered, δόγμασι cannot be taken otherwise than as closely connected with τὸ καθ' ἡμῶν χειρόγραφον: *the bond* (in force) *against us through the ordinances*, and Paul perhaps employed the word δόγμασι in this passage to bring out the notion with prominence. Meyer's explanation: *what has been written with commandments* (Dat. like *what has been written with letters*), is the more forced, because the word χειρόγραφον has acquired from usage so distinct and independent a meaning that it can scarcely take such a Dative after it, as if equivalent to γεγραμμένον.

Note 2. What Kühnöl remarks on Matt. viii. 1, viz. that Datives absolute are sometimes put for Genitives absolute, as καταβάντι αὐτῷ for καταβάντος αὐτοῦ, Matt. xxi. 23 ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ for ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ, was indeed formerly believed, in general, even by scholars (Fischer, Well. III. a. p. 391; Wyttenbach, Plut. Mor. II. 304; Heupel, Mark p. 79). In reality, however, all such Datives (at least in the better class of authors, Wannowski, p.
207 91 sqq.) may be as easily explained from the nature of the Dative, as the
7th ed. Genitive absolute is from the nature of the Genitive; see Bhdy. 82; Stallb. Plat. Protag. 60; Rost, Gr. 712 f. The remark cannot with the slightest plausibility be applied to the passages quoted above from the N. T., as both καταβάντι and ἐλθόντι follow the verb ἀκολουθεῖν; at the same time it must be confessed that the author might also have written: καταβάντος αὐτοῦ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοί, cf. Matt. viii. 28; Mark v. 2 var. There is only this peculiarity in these constructions, that in all αὐτῷ is repeated (because several other words are inserted between the Dative of the participle and the governing verb). In the passages quoted by Kypke I. 47 from Pausan. and Joseph., either there is simply a pronoun joined to the participle, or the pronoun is directly connected with the verb (Joseph. antt. 8, 13, 4); accordingly, they do not prove the point in question. Even in Acts xxii. 6, 17 the Datives are not properly absolute. In the latter passage μοι ὑποστρέψαντι, precisely as in vs. 6, belongs with ἐγένετο.
234 Then follows a quite different construction (with the Genit. absol.): accidit mihi reverso, cum precabar in templo, etc. Cf. Paus. 3, 10, 7 and 25, 3.

Note 3. Two Datives, the one of a person and the other (explaining, more closely defining) of a thing, occur in 2 Cor. xii. 7 ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ

τῇ σαρκί a thorn was given me for (*in*) *the flesh* (Exod. iv. 9; Gen. xlvii. 24) cf. in Homer δίδου οἱ ἡνία χερσίν; Reisig, Soph. Oedip. C. 266; Elmsley, Eurip. Bacch. p. 49, 80, ed. Lips.; Bornem. Xen. conviv. p. 214; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 811; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 278. The two Datives in Eph. iii. 5; Rom. vii. 25; Heb. iv. 2; Rev. iv. 3 are of a different nature, and require no remark.

Note 4. A very singular Dative occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 14 *μὴ γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγοῦντες ἀπίστοις*, where some understand *σύν*, while others attribute this meaning to the Dative itself. But, though the Dat. is sometimes to be resolved by *with* (Reitz, Lucian. VI. 599, Bip.; Mtth. 907; cf. Polyaen. 8, 28), this is an entirely different case. The apostle seems to have expressed himself elliptically, and to have suited the Dative rather to the thought than to the words. He evidently means: *μὴ γίν. ἑτερ. καὶ οὕτως ὁμοζυγοῦντες* (*συζυγ.*) *ἀπίστοις do not put yourselves into an unsuitable yoke*, that is, *be not united in the same yoke with unbelievers.* 198 6th ed.

§ 32. ACCUSATIVE.

1. The Accusative is strictly the Objective Case when joined to *transitive* verbs (active, middle, or deponent); as, *κόπτειν τὴν θύραν, κόπτεσθαι τ. κεφαλήν, φυλάσσειν τ. κῆπον, φυλάσσεσθαι τὰς ἐντολάς.* It must be remarked, however, that,

a. Not only in later and especially in Biblical Greek, many neuter verbs received a transitive (causative) meaning (*μαθητεύειν τινά* § 38, 1.); but, 208 7th ed.

b. In general, certain classes of verbal notions which we consider as either entirely or mainly intransitive, were regarded by the Greeks as transitive. Such are,

α. Verbs denoting *an affection of the mind;* as, *ἐλεεῖν* Matt. ix. 27; Mark v. 19; Phil. ii. 27, etc. (Plato, symp. 173 c.; Ael. 13, 31) and *οἰκτείρειν* Rom. ix. 15, LXX. (Soph. El. 1403; Xen. C. 5, 4, 32; Lucian. abd. 6; Tim. 99), *ἐπαισχύνεσθαί τινα* and *τι* Mark viii. 38; Heb. xi. 16; Rom. i. 16 (Plat. Soph. 247 c.; cf. *αἰσχύνεσθαι* Soph. Oed. R. 1079; Eurip. Io 1074); the last once takes *ἐπί*, Rom. vi. 21 cf. Isocr. permut. 778. On the contrary, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* is regularly construed with *ἐπί*, only once does it govern the Gen. Matt. xviii. 27, see § 33. *Ἐντρέπεσθαί τινα, to reverence one*, Matt. xxi. 37; Luke xviii. 2; Heb. xii. 9, is a later construction, from the time of Plut.; earlier authors said *ἐντρ. τινος.* 235

β. Verbs denoting *to treat one well* or *ill* (*harm, benefit*), or *to speak well* or *ill of one: ἀδικεῖν, βλάπτειν, ὠφελεῖν, λυμαίνεσθαι, ὑβρίζειν τινά* (Xen. Hell. 2, 4, 17; Lucian. pisc. 6); *ἐπηρεάζειν*

τινά (with Dat. pers. Xen. M. 1, 2, 31), λοιδορεῖν τινα Jno. ix. 28; Mtth. 871, βλασφημεῖν τινα Matt. xxvii. 39; Acts xix. 37; Rev. xiii. 6, etc., yet also εἴς τινα Luke xii. 10; cf. Demosth. cor. nav. p. 715 c.; Diod. S. 2, 18 and LXX. hist. Drac. 9 (like the Greek ὀνειδίζειν εἴς τινα and ὑβρίζειν εἴς τινα Lucian. Tim. 31) and ἔν τινι 2 Pet. ii. 12 (in Greek authors also περί τινος Isocr. permut. 736), ὀνειδίζειν τινά Matt. v. 11 (LXX. cf. Rom. xv. 3) Schaef. Plutarch. V. 347 (earlier writers say ὀνειδίζ. τινί or εἴς τινα), κακῶς ἐρεῖν τινα Acts xxiii. 5 (Plat. Euthyd. 284 e.; D. S. Vat. p. 66), also καταρᾶσθαί τινα Matt. v. 44; Jas. iii. 9 (Wisd. xii. 11; Ecclus. iv. 5, etc., with Dative Xen. A. 7, 7, 48). All these constructions are finally grounded on the simple λέγειν or εἰπεῖν τινα, Jno. i. 15; viii. 27; Phil. iii. 18, etc. (Jud. vii. 4); cf. Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 1404; Mtth. II. 929. On the other hand, we find καλῶς ποιεῖν with the
199 Dative of a person, Luke vi. 27 (Acts xvi. 28 μηδὲν πράξῃς σεαυτῷ
6th ed. κακόν is of another kind, and this, with similar expressions, is frequent in Greek writers, Lys. accus. Agor. 41; Xen. C. 5, 4, 11; 5, 5, 14; 8, 7, 24), and also εὖ ποιεῖν Mark xiv. 7. In Greek prose the Acc. is here always preferred, see Biblioth. Brem. nova I. 277. Yet cf. Odyss. 14, 289 ὃς δὴ πολλὰ κάκ' ἀνθρώποισιν ἐώργει. But ποιεῖν τινά τι *to do something to one* occurs also in the N. T. Matt. xxvii. 22; Mark xv. 12. Cf. Aristoph. nub. 258 sq.

γ. Ὀμνύειν τινά Jas. v. 12 (οὐρανόν) *swear by*, cf. Hos. iv. 15; Xen. C. 5, 4, 31; Herod. 2, 10, 3.

Yet in the N. T. these verbs are not invariably connected with the obj. Acc.; many still vary, as in Greek authors, between a transitive and a neuter construction: κλαίειν with Acc. Matt. ii. 18 Sept., but ἐπί τινα Luke xix. 41; xxiii. 28; πενθεῖν τινα 2 Cor. xii. 21, but ἐπί τινι Rev. xviii. 11; κόπτεσθαι τινα Luke viii. 52
209 (Eurip. Troad. 628; 1 Macc. ii. 70) and ἐπί τινα Rev. i. 7; xviii. 9;
7th ed. εὐδοκεῖν τινα Heb. x. 6, 8 Sept. (Lev. xxvi. 34; Ps. li. 18), usually ἔν τινι. Ὀμνύειν is mostly treated as neuter, and construed with κατά τινος, Heb. vi. 13, 16 (Amos viii. 14; Zeph. i. 5; Isa. xlv. 23;
236 Schaef. Long. p. 353) or ἔν τινι Matt. v. 34 ff.; Rev. x. 6 (Jer. v. 2, 7; Ps. lxiii. 12). But in 2 Cor. i. 11 εὐχαρ. (τινί) τι occurs for εὐχαριστεῖν (τινι) ἐπί τινι (in a Passive acceptation); and in 2 Cor. ix. 2; xi. 30 we find καυχᾶσθαι with the Acc. of the thing.

With Jude 15 τῶν ἔργων ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ὧν (ἃ) ἠσέβησαν compare Zeph. iii. 11 τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων σου ὧν ἠσέβησας εἰς ἐμέ (ἀσεβεῖν τι Plato, legg. 12, 941 a. is of another description, Mtth. 923).

Ἱερουργεῖν, ἐργάζεσθαι and ἐμπορεύεσθαι are real transitives, and as ἱερ.

θυσίαν is a proper expression (Palaeph. 5, 3 cf. Acta apocr. 113), so ἱερ. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Rom. xv. 16 in a figurative sense, is quite correct. Ἐμπορεύεσθαι has not only an Acc. of the merchandise but an Acc. of a person, ἐμπ. τινα Ezek. xxvii. 21; this in 2 Pet. ii. 3 means: *make merchandise* (gain) *of you*. Lastly, with Rev. xviii. 17 ὅσοι τὴν θάλασσαν ἐργάζονται compare Appian. Pun. 2; Boisson. Philostr. p. 452. Similar is γῆν ἐργάζ. Paus. 6, 10, 1.

Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι (of Christian preaching) is employed in the N. T. quite like a transitive with the Acc. of a person; as, Luke iii. 18; Acts viii. 25; xiv. 21; compare especially εὐαγγ. τινά τι Acts xiii. 32. Yet εὐαγγ. τινι also occurs Luke iv. 18; Rom. i. 15; Gal. iv. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 6.

Βασκαίνειν *fascinare* also is construed with the Acc. Gal. iii. 1. In the signification *invidere* it has the Dat. (Philostr. epp. 13) Lob. 463. Yet the ancient grammarians are not agreed among themselves on the distinction between the constructions, see Wetsten. II. 221 sq. Παραινεῖν, which in Gr. writers usually governs the Dat. of a person (Aesch. dial. 2, 13; Pol. 5, 4, 7), has the Acc. in Acts xxvii. 22. On the other hand, we find in Rev. ii. 14 διδάσκειν τινί (var.), as in some later writers; see Schaef. Plut. V. 22.

Φυλάσσεσθαι, *to beware of*, likewise governs the Acc. in Acts xxi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 15 (as frequently in Greek authors, Xen. M. 2, 2, 14; Lucian. asin. 4; D. S. 20, 26), as if *to observe, keep a watch on, some one for one's self;* on the other hand, in Luke xii. 15 ἀπό follows it — a construction not unknown also to the Greeks (Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9).

In a similar way, φοβεῖσθαι *to be afraid in reference to something, to* 200
fear something (*for one's self*) is usually construed with the Acc., but 6th ed.
sometimes has ἀπό (*to be afraid of*, sibi *ab* al. timere); as, Matt. x. 28 μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτενόντων τὸ σῶμα ... φοβηθῆτε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον, etc. Greek authors say φοβ. ὑπό τινος or τινι (yet compare φόβος ἀπό τινος Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 53; 6, 3, 27). Φοβεῖσθαι ἀπό is an imitation of the Hebrew יָרֵא (or מִפְּנֵי) מִן (Jer. i. 8). According to this analogy are construed also βλέπειν ἀπό (praegnanter) Mark viii. 15; xii. 38, and προσέχειν ἀπό Matt. xvi. 6. On the other hand, Phil. iii. 2 βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν etc. *observe, keep your eye on* (βλέπειν τι as signifying *to beware of*, could receive no confirmation from φυλάσσεσθαί τι, since the Mid. voice here is 210
essential). *To beware* is here but a derivative meaning. 7th ed. 237

Φεύγειν governs the Acc. in a figurative sense in 1 Cor. vi. 18; 2 Tim. ii. 22 (to flee a vice, i.e. to shun); but once it has ἀπό, 1 Cor. x. 14 φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας. This last construction is otherwise very usual in the N. T. (as in the Sept.), and φεύγειν ἀπό τινος means either *to flee from one* in various senses (Jno. x. 5; Rev. ix. 6; Mark xiv. 52; Jas. iv. 7), or (including the result of fleeing) *to escape* Matt. xxiii. 33. In Greek authors, φεύγειν ἀπό occurs only in a strictly local sense, Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 4; Mem. 2, 6, 31; Plato, Phaed. 62 d.; Pol. 26, 5, 2.

On χρῆσθαί τι see § 31, 1, i. p. 209 sq.

The Acc. of *the place to which*, after verbs of motion, was confined in the classics, after the full use of prepositions had been introduced, mostly to poetry (Mtth. 747). From the character of the language of the N. T., one would expect only a preposition in such a case. Even Acts xxvii. 2 *μέλλοντι πλεῖν τοὺς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν τόπους* (where, however, in several good Codd. [Sin. also] *εἰς* is inserted) forms no exception; it must be rendered: *sail to the places along the Asiatic coast.* In this signification *πλεῖν* is used by the best authors (as a strictly transitive verb) with the Acc. (also of places on the coast),[1] cf. Poppo, Thuc. 6, 36.

2. Neuter verbs expressing a feeling or act, frequently take an Acc. of a noun which is either from the same root or from one of kindred signification. Such nouns, inasmuch as they merely denote substantively the notion of the verb, are virtually implied in it. They are never annexed, except when the meaning of the verb has to be extended (Hm. Soph. Philoct. 281; Eurip. Androm. 220 sq.; Krü. 16 f.) either by an (Objective) Genitive, as 1 Pet. iii. 14 *τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβηθῆτε* (Isa. viii. 12), Col. ii. 19 *αὔξει τὴν αὔξησιν τοῦ θεοῦ* (Plat. legg. 10, 910 d. *ἀσεβεῖν ἀνδρῶν ἀσέβημα*, 1 Macc. ii. 58 *ζηλῶσαι ζῆλον νόμου*, Judith ix. 4); or by means of an Adjective, as Matt. ii. 10 *ἐχάρησαν χαρὰν μεγάλην σφόδρα*, Jno. vii. 24 *τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν κρίνετε*, 1 Tim. i. 18 *ἵνα στρατεύῃ τὴν*
201 *καλὴν στρατείαν* (Plutarch. Pomp. 41), Mark iv. 41 *ἐφοβήθησαν*
6th ed. *φόβον μέγαν*, 1 Tim. vi. 12; 2 Tim. iv. 7; Rev. xvii. 6; 1 Pet. iii. 6 (LXX. Gen. xxvii. 33; Zech. i. 15; Jon. i. 10; iv. 1, 6; Wisd. ix. 3). This, too, is very common in Greek authors, see Fischer, Well. III. I. 422 sq.; Bhdy. 106 f.; Ast, Plat. Polit. 316; Weber, Dem. 471,
238 especially Lob. Paralip. 501 sqq. (Mtth. 744 f., 910 f., 941) cf. Plato, Protag. 360 b. *αἰσχροὺς φόβους φοβοῦνται*, Xen. M. 1, 5, 6 *δουλεύειν*
211 *δουλείαν οὐδεμιᾶς ἧττον αἰσχράν*, Her. 5, 119 *μάχην ἐμαχέσαντο*
7th ed. *ἰσχυρήν* (magnam pugnavimus pugnam Terent. Adelph. 5, 3, 57) Plat. Apol. 28 b. *τοιοῦτον ἐπιτήδευμα ἐπιτηδεύσας*, p. 36 c. *εὐεργετεῖν τὴν μεγίστην εὐεργεσίαν*, Alciphr. 2, 3 *δεῖταί μου πάσας, δεήσεις* Lysias 1; Theomnest. 27 *πολλοὺς δὲ καὶ ἄλλους κινδύνους μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐκινδύνευσε* (Plato, conv. 208 c.), Demosth. Neaer. 517 b.; ep. p. 121 b.; Aristot. polit. 3, 10; rhet. 2, 5, 4; Long. 4, 3; Aeschin. ep. 1, 121 b.; Lucian. asin. 11; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 32. Further see Georgi, Vind. 199 sqq.; Wetst. II. 321 (Gesen. Lg. 810). This

[1] *Wahl's* parallels from Xen. Hell. 4, 8, 6; Pol. 3, 4, 10 only confirm the phrase *πλεῖν τὴν θάλασσαν, τὰ πελάγη*, of which instances already existed in 1 Macc. xiii. 29; Ecclus. xliii. 24.

construction occurs with the passive in Rev. xvi. 9 *ἐκαυματίσθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καῦμα μέγα* (Plato, Euthyd. 275 c. *ὠφελεῖται τὴν μεγίστην ὠφέλειαν*, Plutarch. Caes. 55 a.).

We find the same construction in a relative clause in Jno. xvii. 26 *ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με*, Eph. ii. 4; Mark x. 38 *τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι.*

From this must be distinguished the case in which the kindred noun denotes the objective result of the action, consequently a concrete idea, as *διαθήκην διατίθεσθαι* (Judg. ii. 2), *μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν*, *πλοῦτον πλουτεῖν* (Dan. xi. 2), *ψήφισμα ψηφίζεσθαι*, *ἁμαρτάνειν ἁμαρτίαν* (1 Jno. v. 16), meaning, make a covenant, bear a testimony, etc., Ewald, Gr. 595. For here the noun does not necessarily require the support of an adjective, etc. (as *αἰσχρὰν ἁμαρτ. ἁμαρτάνειν* Soph. Phil. 1249; Plato, Phaed. 113 e.; Lucian. Tim. 112; Dio Chr. 32, 361) cf. Eph. iv. 8 (Sept.) *ᾐχμαλώτευσεν αἰχμαλωσίαν* (Judg. v. 12; 2 Chron. xxviii. 17; Demosth. Steph. 2, 621 b.). Yet constructions of this sort occur, for the most part, only through the interposition of a relative clause; as, Jno. v. 32 *ἡ μαρτυρία, ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ*, 1 Jno. v. 10; Heb. viii. 10 *αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι* (x. 16, but viii. 9 *διαθήκην ποιεῖν*), Acts iii. 25; Luke i. 73; 1 Jno. ii. 25; Mark iii. 28; cf. Isocr. Aegin. 936; Lucian. paras. 5. That such Hebrew and Greek expressions, however, possess greater fulness and vividness than our general phrases, *make a covenant, bear testimony*, there can be no doubt.

Finally, to be separated altogether from the preceding combinations are those in which the substantive denotes something objective and material which exists independently of the action of the verb; as, *φυλάσσειν φυλακάς* (posts) Xen. A. 2, 6, 10; *φόρον φέρειν* Aristoph. av. 191; Aristot. pol. 2, 8; Lucian. paras. 43. Compare from the N. T. Luke ii. 8 *φυλάσσοντες φυλακὰς τῆς νυκτός*, viii. 5 *τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ*, Matt. xiii. 30 *δήσατε δεσμὰς πρὸς τὸ* 239
κατακαῦσαι bind bundles, Matt. vii. 24 *ὅστις ᾠκοδόμησεν τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ*, Luke vi. 48 cf. also 1 Pet. iv. 2 (*ἀκοὴν ἀκούειν* Obad. 1). In these cases sometimes no different expression can be used (cf. *ἀποστόλους ἀποστέλλειν*, legatos legare Cic. Vatin. 15, *γράμματα γράφειν* Dem. Polycl. 710 b.), and the connection of the noun and the verb is purely etymological and historical. On the whole phraseology under this head, which is far more diversified in classic Greek, see Wunder on Lobeck's Sophocl. Aj. S. 37 ff.

202 6th ed.

212 7th ed.

Akin to this construction is ὅρκον ὀμνύναι Luke i. 73 (Demosth. Apat. 579 c.), βιοῦν χρόνον 1 Pet. iv. 2 (ζῆν βίον D. S. exc. Vat. p. 49), δέρειν (πληγὰς) πολλάς, ὀλίγας, which further takes an Acc. of a person (cf. Luke xii. 47). Cf. Wunder, as above, 86. On Luke ii. 44 ἦλθον ἡμέρας ὁδόν *they went a day's journey*, or Acts viii. 39 ἐπορεύετο τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ (cf. ὁδὸν βαδίζειν Plut. Coriol. 9; LXX. 1 Sam. vi. 9; Num. xxi. 33; Exod. xiii. 17), scarcely any remark is necessary; yet see Wunder, 41 f.

Analogous is the construction with the Dative; as, φωνεῖν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Acts xvi. 28, and βοᾶν or κράζειν φωνῇ μεγ. Mark xv. 34; Matt. xxvii. 50; Acts vii. 60, ὅρκῳ ὀμνύναι Acts ii. 30, χαρᾷ χαίρειν 1 Thess. iii. 9 (ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ 1 Pet. i. 8), κηρύσσειν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Rev. v. 2 [text. recept.]; also ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν Jno. xii. 33; xviii. 32. Cf. Aristot. pol. 3, 9; Plut. Coriol. 3 (Jonah i. 16; Acta apocr. 4) Krü. 17 (Bengel, Apoc. xviii. 2) cf. § 54, 3, p. 466.

3. Instead of the Accusative of the object, in many cases a preposition, ἐν (בְּ), is said to be used, according to the Hebrew construction; but the passages adduced, when more closely examined, soon show the admissibility of the preposition in its proper import:

a. In Acts xv. 7 ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη etc., בָּחַר בְּ is not to be referred to, but ἐν ἡμῖν signifies *among us* (the Apostles); for, in the first place, the singular μου is immediately used of Peter, and again, notice is to be taken of τὰ ἔθνη (as the apostolic field of labor): God made choice among us, that the heathen should be instructed through me. See also Olshausen in loc. On the Hebrew בָּחַר בְּ, which in the Sept. is sometimes rendered ἐκλέγ. ἐν (1 Sam. xvi. 9; 1 Kings viii. 16; 1 Chron. xxviii. 4; Neh. ix. 7), but which Gesenius has not even deemed it necessary to explain, see Ewald, Gr. 605.

b. Ὁμολογεῖν ἐν Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8 *to make confession in one*, i.e. (according to another construction) *about one*. Bengel otherwise. The Hebrew expression הוֹדָה עַל Ps. xxxii. 5 has not quite the same meaning.

4. *Two* Accusatives are used,

240 a. One of a person and the other of a thing (Mtth. 930, 932), uniformly after verbs of *clothing* and *unclothing* Jno. xix. 2; Matt. xxvii. 28, 31; Mark xv. 17; Rev. xvii. 4, of (feeding and) *giving to drink* Mark ix. 41; 1 Cor. iii. 2,[1] of *anointing* Rev. iii. 18 (Heb. i. 9), of *loading* Luke xi. 46, of *adjuring* (by) Acts xix. 13; 1 Thess. v. 27, of *reminding* (ἀναμιμνήσκειν) 1 Cor. iv. 17 (Xen. C. 3, 3,

[1] To this class belongs also ψωμίζειν Num. xi. 4; Deut. viii. 16; Wisd. xvi. 20, for which we find in Jambl. Pyth. 13 ψωμίζειν τινά τινι. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. xiii. 3 ψωμίζειν πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα means *to feed out all my goods, bestow in food.*

37; Her. 6, 140; but *ἀναμν. τινά τινος* Xen. C. 6, 4, 13), of *teaching* Jno. xiv. 26, of *asking* and *inquiring* Matt. vii. 9; Jno. xvi. 23; 203
1 Pet. iii. 15 (*αἰτεῖν*), Matt. xxi. 24 (Lob. Paralip. 522), Mark iv. 10 6th ed.
(*ἐρωτᾶν*). On the other hand, *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* is construed only 213
in Acts xiii. 32 with two Accusatives, cf. Heliod. 2, 10; Alciphr. 7th ed.
3, 12; Euseb. H. E. 3, 4, var. For *κρύπτειν τινά τι* (Mtth. 937) the construction *κρύπτειν τι ἀπό τινος* is invariably used, Col. i. 26; Luke xviii. 34; xix. 42, or at least indicated. *Διδάσκειν* is once joined, but according to a somewhat uncertain reading, to *ἔν τινι* of the person, Rev. ii. 14 (as if *instructing on a person*).[1] Other and better Codd. have *ἐδίδασκε τῷ Βαλάκ*, cf. Thilo, Apocr. I. 656 (לְמֹר יְ Job xxi. 22). Besides *αἰτεῖν τινά τι*, we find *αἰτεῖν τι παρά* or *ἀπό τινος* Acts iii. 2; ix. 2; Matt. xx. 20 (Xen. A. 1, 3, 16). Further, *χρίειν τινά* with the Dative of the material occurs Acts x. 38, as *ἀλείφειν* uniformly, Mark vi. 13; Jno. xi. 2, etc.; *ὑπομιμνήσκειν τινὰ περί τινος* 2 Pet. i. 12, also *περιβάλλεσθαι ἐν* Rev. iii. 5; iv. 4, *ἠμφιεσμένος ἐν* Matt. xi. 8; Luke vii. 25 (Dat. in Plat. Protag. 321 a.). For *ἀφαιρεῖσθαί τινά τι* we find *ἀφαιρ. τι ἀπό τινος* Luke xvi. 3.

Heb. ii. 17 *ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας* (cf. Ecclus. xxviii. 5; Dan. ix. 24 Theodot.) *expiare peccata* is perhaps to be explained by supposing that the expression *ἱλάσκεσθαι τὸν θεὸν τὰς ἁμαρτίας* had begun to be used. In 1 Sam. iii. 14 *ἐξιλασθήσεται ἀδικία οἴκου Ἠλί*, the verb is strictly passive.

The same view essentially may be taken (Mtth. 927, 939; Rost 497 f. 503) of the Accusative of a pronoun (*τί, τὸ αὐτό, πάντα*) or neuter adjective (*μέγα*, etc.), which is joined to many verbs along with the Acc. or Gen. of a person (as, *βλάπτειν* Luke iv. 35, *ὠφελεῖν* Gal. v. 2 cf. Lucian. Tim. 119, 241
ἀδικεῖν Acts xxv. 10; Gal. iv. 12; Philem. 18, *μνησθῆναι* 1 Cor. xi. 2); there is however this difference, that in these instances the use of two Accusatives was arrested, as it were, in the first stage. So we Germans say: *jem. etwas, viel* u. s. w. *fragen*, but not on this account: *jem. eine Nachricht fragen*. Hither I refer also Matt. xxvii. 44. Instances of intransitive verbs which are construed with such Accusatives of a thing and have thus become (to a limited extent) transitives, it is scarcely necessary to adduce; yet see 1 Cor. ix. 25 *πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται*, xi. 2; Phil. i. 6; ii. 18; 2 Cor. vii. 14 (cf., however, 1 above) Matt. ix. 14; Rev. v. 4, etc. Fr. explains in the same way also Rom. vi. 10 *ὃ ἀπέθανεν* and Gal. ii. 20 *ὃ νῦν ζῶ ἐν σαρκί*, see above, § 24, note 3, p. 168.

[1] This construction cannot be certainly established in reference to the Hebrew by 2 Chron. xvii. 9, לַמֵּד בִּיהוּדָה as this probably means *teach in Judah*. In Acts vii. 22 *ἐπαιδεύθη πάσῃ σοφίᾳ* is not put for *πᾶσαν σοφίαν* (cf. Diod. S. 1, 91); but the Dative is employed to denote the means of training, whereas *ἐπαιδ. πᾶσαν σοφίαν* would be *edoctus est* (institutus ad) *sapientiam*. The true reading of the passage, however, is probably *ἐν π. σοφίᾳ*, cf. Plat. Crito 50 d.

b. An Acc. of the Subject and of the Predicate (Mtth. 934 f.); as, Jno. vi. 15 ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα, Luke xix. 46 ὑμεῖς αὐτὸν (οἶκον) ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν, Heb. i. 2 ὃν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον (i. 13), Jas. v. 10 ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε τῆς κακοπαθείας . . . τοὺς
214 προφήτας, Heb. xii. 9 τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς πατέρας εἴχομεν παιδευτάς.
7th ed. Phil. iii. 7 ταῦτα (κέρδη) ἥγημαι ζημίαν, 2 Pet iii. 15 τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγεῖσθε, Luke i. 59 ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ . . . Ζαχαρίαν, vs. 53 (Pol. 15, 2, 4). So, in particular, with verbs of
204 *making*, *naming* (appointing), *constituting*, *viewing as*, etc., Matt.
6th ed. iv. 19; xxii. 43; Jno. v. 11; x. 33; xix. 7; Acts v. 31; vii. 10; xx. 28; Luke xii. 14; Rom. iii. 25; vi. 11; viii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 9; ix. 5; 2 Cor. iii. 6; Eph. ii. 14; Phil. ii. 29; Tit. ii. 7; Heb. vii. 28; xi. 26; Jas. ii. 5; Rev. xxi. 5; 2 Sam. ii. 5, 13; iii. 15.

The Acc. of the Predicate (of destination) is, however, sometimes annexed with the preposition εἰς, — Acts xiii. 22 ἤγειρεν αὐτοῖς τὸν Δαυὶδ εἰς βασιλέα, vii. 21 ἀνεθρέψατο αὐτὸν ἑαυτῇ εἰς υἱόν, *for*, *as*, *a son*,[1] xiii. 47 (cf. also the Passive λογίζεσθαι εἴς τι Acts xix. 27; Rom. ii. 26; ix. 8, § 29, 3. Note), — or with ὡς, as 2 Thess. iii. 15 καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρὸν (τοῦτον 14) ἡγεῖσθε (חָשַׁב כְּ). This is a Hebraistic construction (Ewald, Gr. 603), and is frequently imitated in the Sept., Isa. xlix. 6; 2 Kings iv. 1; Judith iii. 8; v. 11; Gen. xii. 2; xliii. 17; 1 Sam. xv. 11; Esth. ii. 7; iv. 4. What has been adduced from classic Greek as parallel to the construction with εἰς is different from it, as the εἰς of destination in Her. 1, 34 πάντες τοῖσι χρέονται ἐς πόλεμον, or Eurip. Troad. 1201 οὐ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος τύχας δαίμων δίδωσι, or Alciphr. 3, 28. On the other hand, real parallels occur in later writers, e.g. Niceph. Constant. p. 51, ed. Bonn.: ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἅπας δῆμος . . . ἀναγορεύουσιν εἰς βασιλέα
242 Ἀρτέμιον, p. 18 εἰς γυναῖκα δίδωμί σοι αὐτήν, Geo. Pachym. I. 349 τὴν ἐκείνου ἔκγονον λαβὼν εἰς γυναῖκα, Theophan. contin. p. 223 κεχρισμένος εἰς βασιλέα. See, in general, the Index to Pachym., Leo Grammat. and Theophan. in the Bonn edition; Acta apocr. p. 71. To the latter mode of expression may also be referred Heb. xi. 8 λαμβάν. εἰς κληρονομίαν, and perhaps Acts vii. 53 ἐλάβετε τὸν νόμον εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων *ye received the law for ordinances of angels*, i.e. as ordinances of angels, see Bengel in loc.; yet εἰς here may be more easily explained by Matt. xii. 41. In Phil. iv. 16. however, the construction εἰς τὴν χρείαν μοι ἐπέμψατε is obviously a different thought from τὴν χρείαν μ. ἐπ., and so does not belong here.

[1] On the other hand, cf. Xen. Anab. 4, 5, 24 πῶλους εἰς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ τρεφομένους, whereas Arrian, Alex. 1, 26, 5 τοὺς ἵππους, οὓς δασμὸν βασιλεῖ ἔτρεφεν, see *Ellendt*, in loc.

time and *place* that the Acc. as an Objective case is still perceptible to us; as, Luke xxii. 41 *ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λίθου βολήν* he withdrew from them *a stone's cast* (as if by his withdrawing he made the distance of a stone's cast), Jno. vi. 19 *ἐληλακότες ὡς σταδίους εἴκοσι πέντε* (Mtth. 950), 1 Pet. iv. 2 *τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἐν σαρκὶ βιῶσαι χρόνον*, Jno. ii. 12 *ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας*, Luke i. 75; ii. 41; xv. 29; xx. 9; Jno. i. 40; v. 5; xi. 6; Matt. ix. 20; Acts xiii. 21; Heb. xi. 23; iii. 17; Mdv. 33 f. The Acc. is thus in the N. T. commonly employed to denote the *duration* of time (but in Jno. v. 5 *ἔτη* is governed by *ἔχων*, see Mey.); sometimes also the
216 (approximate) *point* of time, as Jno. iv. 52 *ἐχθὲς ὥραν ἑβδόμην*
7th ed. *ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός*, Acts x. 3; Rev. iii. 3 (where more frequently *περί* with the Acc. is used) Krü. 13 f.

When the Acc., annexed as a detached word or phrase to other words, gives a closer specification as respects sort, number, degree, sphere — as Jno. vi. 10 *ἀνέπεσαν οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡσεὶ πεντακισχίλιοι* (*in number*), cf. Isocr. big. 842; Aristot. pol. 2, 8; Ptol. 4, 6, 34 (many others in Lob. Phryn. p. 364 sq. and Paralip. 528), Jude 7 *τὸν ὅμοιον τούτοις τρόπον ἐκπορνεύσασαι*, Matt. xxiii. 37 *ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις ἐπισυνάγει*, 2 Tim. iii. 8 (Plat. rep. 7, 517 c.;
206 Plut. educ. 4, 4; 9, 18), Acts xviii. 3 *σκηνοποιὸς τὴν τέχνην* (Lucian.
6th ed. asin. 43; Agath. 2, 46; Acta apocr. p. 61) — it resembles most nearly the Passive construction under 5.[1] This accusative, however, is very rare in the N. T.; even in Acts xviii. 3 the best Codd. [Sin. also] have *τῇ τέχνῃ*, cf. § 31. On the other hand, a number of strictly adverbial Accusatives, which were probably very current in the language of conversation, have found their way into the
244 N. T.; as, *μακράν* (*afar*), *μάτην* (*in cassum*), *ἀκμήν* (this moment) *yet*, *τὴν ἀρχήν* (Jno. viii. 25), *δωρεάν*, *τὸ τέλος* (1 Pet. iii. 8), cf. § 54, 1. See, in general, Hm. Vig. p. 882 sq. To the same class of constructions belong also parenthetic phrases, such as Rom. xii. 18 *εἰ δυνατόν*, *τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν*, *μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες*, ix. 5 (i. 15) Heb. ii. 17; v. 1; Rom. xv. 17; Mtth. 734; Mdv. 36 f.

How the Acc. of quality coincides with the Dative has already been noticed. Thus *τῷ ἀριθμῷ* is used for *τὸν ἀριθμόν*. Usually, however, we find the Acc. in classic Greek where in the N. T. the Dative is employed; e.g. *τὸ γένος* (*natione*) Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 2; Herod. 1, 8, 2; D. S. 1, 4; Arrian. Al. 1, 27, 8 and *τῷ γένει* Mark vii. 26; Acts iv. 36 (Palaeph. 6, 2; 11, 2), *ἐκλύεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ* Heb. xii. 3 and *τὴν ψυχήν* Diod. S. 20, 1, *βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ* Luke xxiv. 25, but *βραδὺς τὸν νοῦν* Dion. H. de Lys. p. 243 Lips.

[1] On the Hebrew cf. *Ewald* 591 f.

See Krü. 15; Lob. Paralip. 528 (Wetst. N. T. I. 826). In Demosth. ep. 4 p. 118 b. we find θρασὺς τῷ βίῳ and μὴ πολίτης τὴν φύσιν side by side. For τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον even Greek prose authors more frequently employ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον.

Very extraordinary is the expression ὁδὸν θαλάσσης in Matt. iv. 15 (from Isaiah) which is rendered *by the way*. Passages such as 1 Sam. vi. 9 εἰ ὁδὸν ὁρίων αὐτῆς πορεύσεται (Wunder on Lob. Sophocl. Aj. 41 f.) Num. xxi. 33; Exod. xiii. 17 (cf. Luke ii. 44), do not authenticate that Acc. without government (by a verb), in an address containing Vocatives. Such a construction would quite exceed the limits of prose composition (Bhdy. 114 f.). What Thiersch p. 145 sq. remarks, is not decisive. Should we perhaps read οἱ ὁδὸν θαλάσσης (οἰκοῦντες), with the Sept.? It is difficult to maintain with Mey. that εἶδε in verse 16 is the governing verb. The topographical difficulties of the usual interpretation are not invincible; only we must not, as in the prophet, take πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου as an independent clause, as that would not apply to this passage in Matthew. 217 7th ed.

7. In some passages the Accusative is said to be used absolutely, when on closer examination the grammatical reason for the Acc. can be discovered in the structure of the sentence. Thus in Rom. viii. 3 τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ... ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ... κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν is properly equivalent to τὸ ἀδύν. τοῦ νόμου ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, πέμψας ... καὶ κατακρίνων etc. (where ἀδύνατον does not require to be taken in a passive sense); this, however, may also be a Nominative put at the commencement (cf. Wisd. xvi. 17). In Acts xxvi. 3 the Acc. γνώστην ὄντα is undoubtedly to be explained as an anacoluthon, which, when participles are annexed, is of frequent occurrence; see § 63, I. 2 a. 207 6th ed. Schwarz, de solocc. p. 94 sq., has adduced nothing altogether of the same kind. 245 In Luke xxiv. 46 f. ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν ... καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν ... ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ, the Acc. (in the construction of the Acc. with the Infinitive) is in itself grammatically clear; only the reference of ἀρξάμενον is loose: *beginning* (viz. the κηρύσσων), or, impersonally, *that it should be begun;* cf. Her. 3, 91. See besides Kypke I. 344 sq. In Rev. i. 20 the Accs. depend on γράψον verse 19, as has long been admitted. Lastly, in Rev. xxi. 17 ἐμέτρησε τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἑκατὸν τεσσαρ. πηχῶν, μέτρον ἀνθρώπου etc., the last words are a loose apposition to the clause ἐμέτρ. τὸ τεῖχος etc.; cf. Mtth. 916. Further, cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 501; Hartung, S. 54; Wannowski, Syntax. anom. p. 128 sqq. On an Acc. in apposition to a whole clause, as Rom. xii. 1, see § 59, 9.

33. CONNECTION OF A VERB (NEUTER) WITH ITS DEPENDENT NOUN BY MEANS OF PREPOSITIONS.

A considerable number of verbs, particularly such as denote an affection or a tendency of the mind, are connected with their predicate by means of a preposition. In this respect the diction of the N. T. sometimes accords with classic usage, and sometimes displays more of a Hebrew and Oriental tinge. We arrange the verbs in question as follows:

a. Verbs of *rejoicing* or *grieving*, which in Greek authors are frequently construed with the Dative alone (Fr. Rom. III. 78 sq.), take for the most part the preposition *ἐπί* with the Dat. (cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 40 sq.), as *χαίρειν* Matt. xviii. 13; Luke i. 14; Acts xv. 31; 1 Cor. xiii. 6; Rev. xi. 10 (cf. Xen. C. 8, 4, 12; D. S. 19, 55; Isocr. permut. 738; Arrian. Ind. 35, 8), *εὐφραίνεσθαι* Rev. xviii. 20 (Ecclus. xvi. 1; 1 Macc. xi. 44; Xen. conv. 7, 5), *συλλυπεῖσθαι* Mark iii. 5 (Xen. Mem. 3, 9, 8; cf. *χαλεπῶς φέρειν ἐπί*
218 *τινι* Xen. H. 7, 4, 21); but sometimes also *ἐν* (*λυπεῖν ἐν* Jacobs,
7th ed. Achill. Tat. p. 814), as *χαίρειν* Luke x. 20; Phil. i. 18 (Col. i. 24. cf. Soph. Trach. 1119), *εὐφραίνεσθαι* Acts vii. 41, *ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι* 1 Pet. i. 6 (but *ἀγάλλεσθαι ἐπί* Xen. Mem. 2, 6, 35; 3, 5, 16).

Of verbs of *being angry*, *ἀγανακτεῖν* is construed with *περί* (to be
246 angry *on account of* some one) Matt. xx. 24; Mark x. 41; but (like *ἀγανακτεῖν ἐπί* Lucian. abdic. 9; Aphthon. progymn. c. 9 p. 267) *ὀργίζεσθαι ἐπί τινι* Rev. xii. 17; cf. Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 9, 8 (in the Sept. even *ὀργίζεσθαι ἔν τινι* Judg. ii. 14, in later Greek writers *ὀργίζεσθαι κατά τινος* as Malal. p. 43, 102, 165, etc.). The opposite, *εὐδοκεῖν*, is construed, in imitation of the Hebrew חָפֵץ בְּ and after the example of the Sept., with *ἐν* (to have pleasure *in*), whether used in reference to persons Matt. iii. 17; Luke iii. 22; 1 Cor. x. 5 or things 2 Cor. xii. 10; 2 Thess. ii. 12 (*θέλειν ἐν* Col. ii. 18 cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 22 ?); in classic Greek the Dative alone would be sufficient.
208 *Ἀρκεῖσθαι*, which usually takes a Dative (Luke iii. 14; Heb. xiii. 5),
8th ed. is once, 3 Jno. 10, construed with *ἐπί*.

b. Verbs denoting *wonder*, *amazement*, take *ἐπί* with the Dative; so *θαυμάζειν* Mark xii. 17; Luke xx. 26, *ἐκπλήσσεσθαι* Matt. xxii. 33; Mark i. 22; xi. 18; Luke iv. 32; Acts xiii. 12, which is also very common in Greek authors. *Θαυμάζειν περί τινος* Luke ii. 18 (Isaeus 3, 28 cf. Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 244) or even *διά τι on account of something* Mark vi. 6, as Aelian. 12, 6; 14, 36 *θαυμάζειν τινὰ διά τι*. But *θαυμάζειν ἐν τῷ χρονίζειν* Luke i. 21 may mean

during his tarrying; yet cf. Sir. xi. 21. On *ξενίζεσθαί τινι* see above, § 31, 1, f. p. 209.

c. Of verbs signifying *to pity*, *σπλαγχνίζεσθαι* usually takes *ἐπί* either with the Acc., Matt. xv. 32; Mark vi. 34; viii. 2; ix. 22, or with the Dat., Luke vii. 13; Matt. xiv. 14, only once Matt. ix. 36 it takes *περί*; but *ἐλεεῖσθαι* is used as a transitive, see § 32, 1, b. *a.*

d. Verbs of *relying on*, *trusting*, *hoping*, *boasting*, are construed with *ἐπί*, *ἐν*, *εἰς*; as, *πέποιθα ἐπί τινι* Mark x. 24; Luke xi. 22; 2 Cor. i. 9 (Agath. 209, 5; 306, 20), *ἐπί τι* or *τινα* Matt. xxvii. 43; 2 Thess. iii. 4, with *ἐν* Phil. iii. 3; *πιστεύειν ἐπί τινι* Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 6 Sept. (on *πιστεύειν εἰς* or *ἐπί τινα believe on one*, see above, § 31, 5), *ἐλπίζειν ἐπί* with Dat. Rom. xv. 12; Phil. iv. 10 (Pol. 1, 82, 6) and with Acc. 1 Tim. v. 5; 1 Macc. ii. 61, *εἰς* Jno. v. 45; 2 Cor. i. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 5; Ecclus. ii. 9 (Herod. 7, 10, 1; Joseph. bell. jud. 6, 2, 1, *ἡ εἴς τινα ἐλπίς* Plut. Galba c. 19), *ἐν* 1 Cor. xv. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 25; Mem. 4, 2, 28; Pol. 1, 59, 2 *ἐλπίδα ἔχειν ἔν τ.*), *καυχᾶσθαι ἐπί τινι* Rom. v. 2 (Ps. xlviii. 7; Ecclus. xxx. 2; D. S. 16, 70, similarly *σεμνύνεσθαι* Diog. L. 2, 71; Isocr. big. p. 840 and *φυσιοῦσθαι* Diog. L. 6, 24), more frequently *ἐν* Rom. ii. 17, 23; v. 3; 1 Cor. iii. 21; Gal. vi. 13 (Ps. cxlix. 5; Jer. ix. 23), but not *κατά* 2 Cor. xi. 18 see Mey. in loc., also not *ὑπέρ* 2 Cor. vii. 14 cf. ix. 2.

e. Of verbs of *sinning*, *offending against*, *ἁμαρτάνειν* is connected by *εἰς* with the object sinned *against*, Matt. xviii. 21; Luke xvii. 4; 219
1 Cor. vi. 18 etc., cf. Soph. Oed. C. 972; Her. 1, 138; Isocr. panath. 7th ed.
p. 644; permut. p. 750 and Aegin. p. 920, 934; Mr. Anton. 7, 26; 247
Wetsten. I. 443; on the other hand, *ἁμαρτάν. πρός τινα* Joseph. antt. 14, 15, 2, *περί τινα* Isocr. permut. 754 (*ἁμαρτ. τινί* 1 Sam. xiv. 33; 1 Kings viii. 31, 33; Judg. x. 10).

f. The verbs *ἀρέσκειν please*, and *φανῆναι appear* (so and so), instead of the Dative of the person to whom something gives pleasure or appears (in such or such a light), are connected with the noun by the Hellenistic preposition *ἐνωπιον*; as, Acts vi. 5 *ἤρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους* (Deut. i. 23), Luke xxiv. 11 *ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα.* In the Sept. *ἀρέσκειν* occurs also with *ἐναντίον τινός* Num. xxxvi. 6; Gen. xxxiv. 18; 1 Macc. vi. 60.

g. Of verbs of *seeing*, *βλέπειν* is often construed with *εἰς* (*intueri*) Jno. xiii. 22; Acts iii. 4, which is not unknown to classic Greek also; see Wahl.

There is properly speaking a redundancy when verbs of *following* are

construed with the preposition μετά or σύν (cf. comitari *cum* aliquo in Latin
209 inscriptions), Rev. vi. 8; xiv. 13; see Wetst. N. T. I. 717; Lob. Phryn.
6th ed. p. 354; Schaef. Dem. V. 590; Hm. Lucian. p. 178; Krü. 63. The phrase ἀκολουθῶ ὀπίσω τινός (אַחֲרֵי) Matt. x. 38 (Isa. xlv. 14) is Hebraistic.

Substantives derived from such verbs are in the same way connected with the object by means of prepositions; as, πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ Gal. iii. 26; Eph. i. 15 etc., παρουσία πρὸς ὑμᾶς Phil. i. 26, θλίψεις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν Eph. iii. 13, ζῆλος ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ 2 Cor. vii. 7, see Fr. Rom. I. 195, 365 sq.

§ 34. ADJECTIVES.

1. Although the two sorts of nouns, substantive and adjective, are distinct from each other in thought, yet the latter (including participles) enter the sphere of substantives far more abundantly in Greek than, for instance, in Latin. This they do whether they have or have not the Article, and in every gender; sometimes owing to an original ellipsis, and sometimes without an ellipsis,
248 by virtue of the Gender, whether masculine or neuter, peculiar to them (Krü. 2 f.); as, ἡ ἔρημος (γῆ), τῇ ἐπιούσῃ (ἡμέρᾳ), διοπετές (ἄγαλμα) Acts xix. 35, τὸ σηρικόν (ὕφασμα?) Rev. xviii. 12, ὁ σοφός, ὁ κλέπτων Eph. iv. 28, βασιλικός, ὁ ἄρχων, ἀλλότριοι *strangers*, κακοποιοί *evil-doers*, τὸ ἀγαθόν (τὸ πνευματικόν, ψυχικόν 1 Cor. xv. 46?).

On adjectives which have become substantives by an ellipsis, see § 64. Among expressions relating to persons, as σοφός, οἱ σοφοί, the following are characteristic of the N. T.: ὁ πιστός *the believer*, πιστοί *believers*, ἅγιοι, ἐκλεκτοί, ἁμαρτωλοί Rom. xv. 31; xvi. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Cor. vi. 15; 1 Tim. i. 15; v. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 10; Heb. xii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 22; so even with an attributive Adjective, Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 2 κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, or with a
220 Gen. Rom. viii. 33 ἐκλεκτοὶ θεοῦ. In all these cases persons are indicated
7th ed. to whom the quality in question belongs; and there is no necessity for supplying ἄνθρωποι (or ἀδελφοί). Likewise where ὁ ἀληθινός 1 Jno. v. 20 is used of God, or ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ Luke iv. 34 of Christ, or ὁ πονηρός of the devil, there is no ellipsis of those substantives, but the notion is grammatically complete: *the True, the Holy One of God;* and what individual is distinctively so called in Biblical diction, must be ascertained from other sources.

2. Especially frequent and diversified are Neuters used substantively (Krü. 3). Many of these even regularly take the place of a substantive derivable (but not always actually existing) from the root; and this, not only in reference to things sensible, μέσον, ἔσχατον, μικρόν, βραχύ, ὀλίγον, φανερόν, κρυπτόν, ἔλαττον, ἄρσεν, etc., especially with a preposition (εἰς τὸ μέσον Mark iii. 3; Jno. xx. 19,

μετὰ μικρόν Matt. xxvi. 73, ἐν ὀλίγῳ Acts xxvi. 29, ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Matt. vi. 4, εἰς φανερόν Mark iv. 22), but also mental and abstract, particularly with a Gen. annexed, as Rom. ii. 4 τὸ χρηστὸν τ. θεοῦ (ἡ χρηστότης), Heb. vi. 17 τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς, Rom. viii. 3; ix. 22; 1 Cor. i. 25; 2 Cor. iv. 17; Phil. iii. 8 τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως, iv. 5 τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ὑμῶν. Instead of the Gen. another construction is selected in Rom. i. 15 τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον (τὸ πρόθυμον 210
purpose Eur. Iphig. 983). The Plurals of adjectives are regularly 6th ed.
concretes, and denote whole classes of things (persons); as, τὰ ὁρατὰ κ. ἀόρατα Col. i. 16, ἐπουράνια and ἐπίγεια Jno. iii. 12; Phil. ii. 10, τὰ βαθέα Rev. ii. 24, ἀρχαῖα 2 Cor. v. 17. Such adjectives, moreover, sometimes are made more specific by the context: thus, ἐπουράνια Jno. as above heavenly *truths*, Phil. ii. 10 heavenly *beings*, Eph. ii. 6; iii. 10 heavenly *places* (i.q. οὐρανοί, cf. var. Eph. i. 20) etc. In Rom. i. 20 τὰ ἀόρατα τοῦ θεοῦ the Plural refers to the partition that follows, ἥ τε ἀΐδιος δύναμις καὶ θειότης, and Philippi has 249
explained the word more correctly than Fr. (On Eph. vi. 12 πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας, see Note 3.)

The expression τὸ δοκίμιον τῆς πίστεως in 1 Pet. i. 7 does not come under this head, as δοκίμιον of itself is a substantive, (no adjective δοκίμιος exists); further, compare on this passage and on Jas. i. 3, Fr. Prälim. S. 44. In Rom. i. 19, too, τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ is not simply i.q. ἡ γνῶσις τ. θ., otherwise it would not be easy to see why Paul did not employ ἡ γνῶσις, so usual to him; but the meaning is either *what is known* (to mankind) *of God*, or *what is knowable* (may be known) *of* (about) *God*. (In reference to the latter meaning of γνωστός, which Thol. questioned, see Soph. Oed. R. 362; Hm. Plat. rep. 7, 517 b.; Arrian. Epict. 2, 20, 4, cf. Schulthess, theol. Annal. 1829, S. 976.) I prefer the former as the simpler. Paul is speaking of the *objective* knowledge, of the sum of that which is known of God (from what source see verse 20). This objective γνωστόν becomes *subjective*, in as far as φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς. This shows, too, why Paul did not use ἡ γνῶσις here.

The preceding mode of expression, which flows quite simply from the 221
nature of the Neuter, is not unknown to the Greeks. The later prose 7th ed.
authors in particular adopted it from the technical language of philosophy. At the same time, the examples collected by Georgi (Hierocrit. I. 39) must be carefully sifted. The following may serve as unquestionable parallels: Demosth. Phil. 1. p. 20 a. τὸ τῶν θεῶν εὐμενές, and de fals. leg. p. 213 a. τὸ ἀσφαλὲς αὐτῆς, Thuc. 1, 68 τὸ πιστὸν τῆς πολιτείας, 2, 71 τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῆς γνώμης, Galen. protrept. 2 τὸ τῆς τέχνης ἄστατον and τὸ τῆς βάσεως εὐμετακύλιστον, Heliod. 2, 15, 83 τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς λύπης, Plat. Phaedr. 240 a.; Strabo 3, 168; Philostr. Ap. 7, 12; D. S. 19, 55; Diog.

L. 9, 63. This construction with the participle is especially characteristic of Thuc. (and the Byzantines). Cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 253; Niebuhr, ind. ad Dexipp. Eunap. and Malch. An abstract noun and neuter adjectives in connection occur in Plutarch, Agis 20 *ἡ πολλὴ εὐλάβεια καὶ τὸ πρᾷον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον.*

3. On the other hand, a notion which should naturally be expressed by an adjective as an epithet,[1] is sometimes, by a change
211 of construction, brought out by a substantive. Yet the N. T. is
6th ed. by no means poor in adjectives; it can show a considerable number which do not occur in the (early) Greek authors, and some of which have been formed by the apostles themselves (*ἐπιούσιος, σαρ-*
250 *κικός, πνευματικός, παρείσακτος, πύρινος, ἀκατάκριτος, ἀκρογωνιαῖος, ἀνεπαίσχυντος, αὐτοκατάκριτος, ἀχειροποίητος, βρώσιμος, ἐπιπόθητος, εὐπερίστατος, ἰσάγγελος, κατείδωλος, κυριακός, ταπεινόφρων* etc.).

This substitution of a substantive for an adjective takes place,

a. In such a way that the substantive which is the *principal word* stands in the Genitive: 1 Tim. vi. 17 *μὴ ἠλπικέναι ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι not to trust in the uncertainty of riches* i.e. in riches which are uncertain, Rom. vi. 4 *ἵνα ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν*, vii. 6.

This form of expression, however, is not arbitrary, but is designed to give greater prominence to the main idea, which if expressed by an adjective would recede more into the background. It is rhetorical, therefore, not grammatical. Cf. Zumpt, Lat. Gramm. S. 554 and examples from Greek authors in Held, Plut. Timol. p. 368.

Properly only those passages come under this head in which, to the substantive that is followed by a Genitive, a verb is joined which from the nature of the case suits rather the substantive in the Genitive, and consequently points it out as the principal noun (as, ingemuit corvi *stupor*, or the above *ἐλπίζ. ἐπὶ πλούτου ἀδηλότητι*). On the other hand, such passages as the following are to be decidedly excluded from this class:[2] Col. ii. 5 *βλέπων τὸ στερέωμα τῆς πίστεως*, 2 Cor. iv. 7 *ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς δυνάμεως*
222 *ᾖ τοῦ θεοῦ*, Gal. ii. 14 *ὀρθοποδεῖν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου*, ii. 5, also
7th ed. 2 Thess. ii. 11 *πέμπει ἐνέργειαν πλάνης*. In Heb. ix. 2 *ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων*

[1] On the case in which an adjective as a predicate is expressed by means of a substantive for rhetorical reasons, as in 2 Cor. iii. 9 *εἰ ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα*, see § 58.

[2] *Fr.* Rom. I. 367 sq. has objected to this separation, which however he appears to have misunderstood. In passages of the second kind the statement is merely logical, in those of the first it is rhetorical. When it is said, *live according to the truth of the Gospel*, we are to understand the words in their proper and natural meaning (the *truth* of the Gospel is the rule of life); but when it is said, corvi stupor ingemuit, the statement is *figurative*, like, *his blood called for vengeance*. Cic. N. D. 2, 50, 127 belongs to the second class, and foedo odore would be the less exact expression.

signifies: *the setting before, exposition, of the bread;* and in 1 Pet. i. 2 ἁγιασμὸς πνεύματος, as a glance at the context will show, is not synonymous with πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Lastly, the phrase λαμβάνειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος in Acts ii. 33; Gal. iii. 14 means: *obtain the promise of the Spirit,* which happens when the promised blessing itself is received (κομίζεσθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν), when the promise becomes fulfilment.

b. Far more frequently so that the noun which expresses a *quality* (mostly moral) stands in the Genitive: Luke iv. 22 λόγοι τῆς χάριτος, xvi. 8 οἰκονόμος τῆς ἀδικίας, xviii. 6 κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας, Col. i. 13 υἱὸς τῆς ἀγάπης, Rev. xiii. 3 ἡ πληγὴ τοῦ θανάτου *mortal wound*, Rom. i. 26 πάθη ἀτιμίας, 2 Pet. ii. 10; Jas. i. 25; Heb. i. 3.[1] This, in prose, is a Hebraistic mode of expression, (and is to be 251
attributed not merely to the want of adjectives in Hebrew, Ewald 212
572, but to the peculiar vividness of the Oriental languages). 6th ed.
In the more elevated style, however, there are instances of the same construction even in Greek authors, see Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 826, cf. Pfochen, diatr. p. 29; but the examples in Georgi, Vind. p. 214 sqq. are nearly all useless.[2] In later writers it intrudes into plain prose, Eustath. Gramm. p. 478.

If in such expressions a Gen. of a personal pronoun be annexed, it is rendered as belonging to the entire idea; as, Heb. i. 3 τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ *by his mighty word*, Col. i. 13; Rev. iii. 10; xiii. 3. It is common to go still further, and to assert (e.g. Vorst, Hebraism. p. 570 sq.; Storr, observ. p. 234 sq.) that when two nouns combined denote *one* principal notion, the *demonstrative* pronoun also, according to the Hebrew idiom (?), agrees grammatically with the governed noun;[3] as, Acts v. 20 τὰ ῥήματα 223
τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης for ταῦτα *these words of life*, xiii. 26 ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας 7th ed.
ταύτης *this doctrine of salvation*, Rom. vii. 24 ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου, cf. the Peschito ܡܦܘܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܕܡܘܬܐ. But this rule (which even Bengel has adopted) is imaginary. In Rom. vii. τούτου may have been construed with σώματος by Paul himself; but it is not without ap-

[1] But 2 Thess. i. 7 ἄγγελοι δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ are *angels of his power*, i.e. who serve his power.

[2] The Genitive of *material* does not come under this head. The expression λίθου κριός e.g. was to the Greeks like our ram *of stone*, and it is only the Latin idiom that would require the use of the adjective here. Likewise ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας Phil. iv. 18 (cf. Aristot. rhet. 1, 11, 9) is probably *fragrance of sweet odor*, and not quite equivalent to εὐώδης. That 1 Cor. x. 16 τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας and Rom. i. 4 πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης are not to be explained by the above rule, is now admitted by the best expositors. For still more unsatisfactory examples, see *Glass.* I, 26 sq.

[3] Some attempt to prove this to be a Hebraism by Ezra ix. 14 בְּנָתֶי֙ הַתִּתְעַבּ֣וֹת הָאֵ֔לֶּה, where, however, there is no necessity whatever for construing אֵ֔לֶּה with the second substantive.

propriate sense, if connected with *θανάτου*. As the apostle had already said much of *θάνατος* (verse 10 ff.), he might naturally refer to it; see de Wette in loc. Likewise in Acts xiii. *σωτὴρ Ἰησοῦς* had already been expressed in verse 23, and accordingly *ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας ταύτης* means: *the word of this* (through Christ effected) *salvation*. In Acts v. the pronoun refers to the salvation which the apostles were then engaged in preaching. Even the Hebrew construction, as אֶלֹהֵי כַסְפּוֹ Isa. ii. 20 or שֶׁבֶן קָדְשִׁי Ps. lxxxix. 21, which, though according to the rule, is at the same time much more natural as both words are properly one, has not been literally translated so in the Sept. Cf. Isa. as above, *τὰ βδελύγματα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ*,
252 Deut. i. 41 *τὰ σκεύη τὰ πολεμικὰ αὐτοῦ*, Ps. as above, *ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ*. In fact it is not easy to perceive, how Luke and Paul, in statements so simple, came to employ such an irregular construction. What Georgi, Vind. p. 204 sqq., and Munthe, obs. Acts v. 20, quote from Greek authors, loses all plausibility when closely examined (Fr. Exc. 1. ad Mr. p. 771 sq.).

Note 1. The Hebraism (Gesen. Lehrgeb. S. 661; Vorst, Heb. 282 sq.)
213 according to which the Neuter of an adjective is expressed by its Feminine,
6th ed. is said to occur in Luke xi. 33 *εἰς κρυπτὴν τίθησι*. Absurd! *κρυπτή* had already become a substantive, signifying a *covered place* or *passage*, a *subterraneous receptacle, vault* (Athen. 5, 205); and this meaning is quite appropriate in the passage. On the other hand, Matt. xxi. 42 (Mark xii. 11) *παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη* (*τοῦτο*), *καὶ ἐστὶ θαυμαστὴ* (*θαυμαστόν*) is a quotation from Ps. cxvii. 23; even the Sept., however, may have referred the Feminine to *κεφαλὴ γωνίας* (Wolf, cur. ad h. l.).

Note 2. We must here mention another Hebraistic (Vorst, Hebraism. 467 sqq.) circumlocution (as it is called) for certain concrete adjectives when employed as substantives, viz. by the use of *υἱός* or *τέκνον* followed by a Genitive of the abstract; as, *υἱοὶ ἀπειθείας* Eph. ii. 2 i.e. *the disobedient*, *υἱοὶ φωτός* Luke xvi. 8; Jno. xii. 36, *τέκνα φωτός* Eph. v. 8, *τέκνα ὀργῆς* ii. 3, *τέκνα ὑπακοῆς* 1 Pet. i. 14, *τέκνα κατάρας* 2 Pet. ii. 14, *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας* 2 Thess. ii. 3. Every one must feel that these expressions are not mere circumlocutions, but phrases which bring out the meaning with greater vivacity and force. This phraseology is traceable to the vivid imagination of Orientals, which even in the realm of ideas represents the most intimate
224 relationship (derivation or dependence) under the image of son or child
7th ed. (Ecclus. iv. 11). *Children of disobedience*, therefore, are those who belong to *ἀπείθεια* as a child to its mother — those in whom disobedience has become predominant and a second nature (compare in Hebrew, Deut. iii. 18; xxv. 2; 2 Sam. xii. 5; Ps. lxxxix. 23). (The expressions *παῖδες ἰατρῶν*, *δυστήνων* — especially in Lucian — Schaef. Dion. 313, grammatically rather resemble *υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*. Παῖς or *τέκνον* joined to an *abstract* noun, as in the preceding quotations, neither Schwarz nor Georgi has been able to vindicate by any passage from Greek prose. For an instance from ecclesiastical authors, see Epiphan. Opp. I. 380 b. *οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἀληθινῆς*

πίστεως. Strictly similar phraseology is not to be expected in modern European languages; *child of death*, for instance, is derived from the diction of the Bible. In the more elevated style, however, a few such expressions are used: every one *is the offspring of his age*. See, in general, Steiger on 1 Pet. as above; Gurlitt in Stud. u. Kritik. 1829, S. 728 f. Of a different nature is 2 Thess. ii. 3 ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἁμαρτίας — not i.q. ὁ ἁμαρτωλός — *the man of sin*, that is, he who peculiarly belongs to sin, the representative of sin, its personification.)

Note 3. In Eph. vi. 12 the expression τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας is 253
peculiar. The Greek idiom to which expositors here refer (see Koppe in loc.; Fischer, Weller. III. I. 295), παρθενικοί for παρθένοι (Lob. Paralip. 305 sq.), was in the better period merely poetical, and is not quite analogous. In the Byzantines, however, we find e.g. ἡ ἱππική for ἡ ἵππος (Ducas, p. 18); and (τὰ) δαιμόνια, which was originally an adjective but which in later Greek is used substantively along with δαίμονες, affords in the main a proper analogy. A Genitive joined to it e.g. τὰ δαιμόνια τοῦ ἀέρος would present no difficulty. But in the above passage of Eph. the abstract appears to have been purposely chosen as a contrast to πρὸς αἷμα καὶ σάρκα: *your struggle is not against outward but against spiritual adversaries*. If, however, any one is unwilling to take πνευματικά for πνεύματα, 214
it can only be regarded as a collective Plural, like τὰ λῃστρικά in Polyaen. 6th ed.
5, 14 (robber-hordes, from τὸ λῃστρικόν the robber class or profession) Lob. Phryn. 242, and rendered: *the spiritualities of wickedness*, wicked spiritual powers; see Mey. in loc.

§ 35. COMPARATIVE.[1]

1. Degrees of Comparison are expressed exactly as in classical Greek; that is, by means of the appropriate form of the adjective, that with which the comparison is made being subjoined in the Genitive, or, especially when it is a whole clause,[2] connected by ἤ: 225
Jno. iv. 12 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν; i. 51; xiii. 16; Mark 7th ed.
xii. 31; 1 Cor. i. 25; 1 Tim. v. 8; Heb. xi. 26; Jno. iv. 1 πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ ἢ Ἰωάννης, 1 Cor. xiv. 5; 1 Jno. iv. 4; Rom. xiii. 11 ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία ἢ ὅτε ἐπιστεύσαμεν, 2 Pet. ii. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 15; Klotz, Devar. 583. After πλείων or ἐλάττων before a numeral, ἤ is often omitted (Mtth. 1019); so in Acts xxiv. 11 οὐ πλείους εἰσί μοι ἡμέραι δεκαδύο, iv. 22; xxiii. 13; xxv. 6; cf. Ter. Ad. 2, 1, 46 plus quingentos colaphos infregit mihi. See Lob. Phryn. 410 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. p. 261. The contrary in Luke ix. 13.

[1] Cf. in general *G. W. Nitzsch* de comparativis graecae linguae modis, in his edition of Plat. Ion. Lips. 1822, 8vo.

[2] In such a case we find in the Sept. the Genitive of the Infinitive also, Gen. iv. 13.

It is sometimes doubtful whether the Genitive following a Comparative contains the second member of the comparison, or is altogether independent
254 of the comparison. In Heb. iii. 3 *πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου* etc. it is probably most correct to take *οἴκου* in the former way; but 1 Cor. xiii. 13 *μείζων τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη* may be rendered: (*greater*) *the greatest* (*of*) *among these is love;* see No. 3. Cf. besides, 1 Cor. xii. 23; Luke vii. 42 (Lucian. fug. 6).

The Comparative is strengthened by annexing *μᾶλλον*,[1] 2 Cor. vii. 13 *περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον* (Plato, legg. 6, 781 a.), Phil. i. 23 *πολλῷ μᾶλλον κρεῖσσον* (*much more better*), and in reference to another comparison, Mark vii. 36 *ὅσον αὐτοῖς διεστέλλετο, αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον περισσότερον ἐκήρυσσον*, see Fr. in loc.; also by *ἔτι* Heb. vii. 15 *περισσότερον ἔτι κατάδηλον* (*still more evident*), Phil. i. 9; lastly, by *πολύ*, as 2 Cor. viii. 22 *πολὺ σπουδαιότερον*. All these are very common in Greek authors (Krü. 79): on *μᾶλλον* see Wyttenb. Plut.
215 I. 238; Ast, Plat. Phaedr. p. 395; legg. p. 44; Boisson. Aristaen. p. 430 sqq.
6th ed. (in Lat. cf. Cic. Pis. 14 mihi ... quaevis fuga *potius* quam ulla provincia esset optatior); as to *ἔτι* cf. Plat. pol. 298 e.; Xen. M. 1, 5, 6; Cyr. 5, 4, 20; Anab. 1, 9, 10, and as to *πολύ* Xen. M. 2, 10, 2; Lucian. Tim. 50. In Greek authors sometimes *ἔτι πολύ* are conjoined: Xen. M. 2, 1, 27; C. 1, 6, 17; Anab. 7, 5, 15.

Also when prepositions are employed after the Comparative they are designed to give it additional force; as, Luke xvi. 8 *φρονιμώτερον ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτός*, Heb. iv. 12; Judg. xi. 25; xv. 2; xviii. 26; Heb. ix. 23 *κρείττοσι θυσίαις παρὰ ταύτας*, i. 4; iii. 3; xi. 4; xii. 24; Luke iii. 13. Compare, in reference to *παρά*, Thuc. 1. 23 *πυκνότερον παρὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ πρὶν χρόνου μνημονευόμενα*, Dio C. 38, 97. See Hm. Vig. 862.

2. Instead of the Comparative form, the Positive is used,

a. With *μᾶλλον*, partly when the Comparative form seemed uncouth, partly when more emphasis was required (Krü. 78), Acts xx. 35 *μακάριόν ἐστι μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν*, 1 Cor. xii. 22; Gal. iv. 27.

226 b. With a preposition following which contains the notion of
7th ed. comparison; as, Philostr. Apol. iii. 19 *παρὰ πάντας Ἀχαίους μέγας*. So Luke xiii. 2 *ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Γαλιλαίους* (though *ἁμαρ.*, to be sure, has no comparative), Heb. iii. 3. In the Sept. *παρά* and *ὑπέρ* are often thus used: Exod. xviii. 11; Num. xii. 3; Hagg. ii. 9; Eccl. iv. 9; ix. 4; 1 Sam. i. 8.

c. With *ἤ* following; as, Aristot. probl. 29, 6 *παρακατατθήκην*

[1] Μᾶλλον is not joined to the Superlative, and in 2 Cor. xii. 9 *ἥδιστα οὖν μᾶλλον καυχήσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου*, the word *μᾶλλον* belongs to the whole expression *ἥδιστα καυχ.* etc., *rather, then, will I glory most gladly*, etc., i.e. than, repining, beseech God to remove the *ἀσθεν.* (verse 8 f.). The word *ἥδιστα* indicates the degree of *καυχᾶσθαι*, while *μᾶλλον* forms the antithesis to what precedes.

αἰσχρὸν ἀποστερῆσαι μικρὸν ἢ πολὺ δανεισάμενον (Held, Plut. Timol. 317 sq.). This, on the whole, is of rare occurrence; but the analogous *βούλομαι* or *θέλω ἤ*, *malle*, became a current phrase, 255
Her. 3. 40; Polyb. 13, 5, 3; Plut. Alex. 7; Sulla 3. This usage may be most simply explained by supposing that *ἤ* (owing to the Comparative construction) had come to be regarded as a proportional particle, presupposing, or to a certain extent directly expressing, a comparison;[1] cf. Plaut. rud. 4, 4, 70 tacita bona est mulier semper quam loquens, Tac. ann. 3, 17.

Now, in the N. T. we find not merely *θέλω ἤ* 1 Cor. xiv. 19 and *λυσιτελεῖ ἤ satius est quam* Luke xvii. 2 (Tob. iii. 6), but, as in Greek authors (Lys. affect. tyr. 1), this use of *ἤ* is extended to other connections; as, Luke xv. 7 *χαρὰ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενηκονταεννέα δικαίοις greater* joy than etc., cf. Num. xxii. 6 *ἰσχύει οὗτος ἢ ἡμεῖς*. With adjectives we find only a single example, but in both relations, Matt. xviii. 8 *καλόν σοί ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ κυλλόν, ἢ δύο χεῖρας . . . ἔχοντα βληθῆναι* etc. Mark ix. 43, 45. On the other hand, this construction is of frequent occurrence in the Sept., Gen. xlix. 12; Hos. ii. 7; Jon. iv. 3, 8; Lam. iv. 9; Tob. xii. 8; Ecclus. xxii. 15, and there it was suggested by the Hebrew, which also makes the comparison follow the adjective in the preposition מִן. In Greek authors com- 216
pare with Luke xvii. (above) *ζῆν ἀταράχως συμφέρει ἢ τὸ τρυφᾶν* 6th ed.
etc. Aesop. 121 de Fur. (Tob. vi. 13), in Adject. and Adv. Thuc. 6, 21 *αἰσχρὸν βιασθέντας ἀπελθεῖν ἢ ὕστερον ἐπιμεταπέμπεσθαι*, Plut. Pelop. 4 *τούτους ἂν ὀρθῶς κ. δικαίως προσαγορεύσεις συνάρχοντας ἢ ἐκείνους*, Aesop. 134 de Fur. See d'Orville, Char. p. 538; Boisson. Marini Procl. p. 78; Kypke I. 89; II. 228 and Nitsch l. c. p. 71.

Luke xviii. 14 with the reading *κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος . . . ἢ ἐκεῖνος*, would according to the preceding idiom be free from difficulty; cf. Gen. xxxviii. 26 *δεδικαίωται Θάμαρ ἢ ἐγώ* (only a comparison is not quite suitable here). All the better Codd., however, read *ἢ γάρ* (see also Matthäi, small ed., in loc.), which is without a parallel. Yet on Hermann's theory (followed also by Bornem. in loc.) the passage may be perhaps resolved thus: this one went away justified . . . *or* (went) *then the other* etc.? The *γάρ* must have been annexed, as elsewhere to interrogative words (also to *ἤ*, e.g. Xen. C. 8, 3, 40; Soph. Electr. 1212 f.), for emphasis. Probably 227
the reading in some Codd. *ἤπερ* (which in Jno. xii. 43 does not differ from *ἤ*) 7th ed.

[1] The explanation given by *Hermann*, Vig. 884 and *Schaef.* ind. Aesop. p. 138, cf. *Held*, Plut. Tim. p. 317, is more artificial. The earlier grammarians supplied *μᾶλλον* before the Positive.

256 is rather a correction of ἢ γάρ than the origin of it. Lchm., Tdf. in his first edition, and Mey. read παρ' ἐκεῖνον [so too Cod. Sin.], which would be quite free from difficulty (justified *beyond* i.e. to the neglect of the other).

3. The Comparative places over against the object compared but *one* thing as comparable, whether this one thing be an individual or a complex whole; as, Jno. xiii. 16 οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου, v. 20 μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, x. 29. If the Genitive annexed denotes *all* things of the same kind, as Mark iv. 31 μικρότερος πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, verse 32; Luke xxi. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 19; Eph. iii. 8, it is to be understood of course with the exception of the thing compared: *smaller than all* (other) *seeds;* and the Comparative may be rendered also by the Superlative: *the smallest of all seeds.* This mode of expression occurs also in Greek authors: Demosth. falsa leg. 246 b. πάντων τῶν ἄλλων χείρω πολίτην, Athen. 3, 247 πάντων καρπῶν ὠφελιμώτερα, Dio Chr. 3, 39 ἁπάντων πιθανώτερος, see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 247.

In 1 Cor. xiii. 13 μείζων τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη the Comparative is not put for the Superlative; but the meaning is: the *greater of* (among) *these is love*, and the Comparative is employed because the other two graces were regarded as forming but a *single* class in contrast with love.

4. The Comparative is not unfrequently used when the object of comparison is not expressly mentioned; Reiz, de accent. inclin. p. 54; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 418, 538; Stallb. Phileb. p. 120 and rep. 1, 238; Mtth. 1021 f.; Krü. 77.

In such cases this may ordinarily be gathered easily from the context, Jno. xix. 11; Acts xviii. 20; 1 Cor. vii. 38 (cf. vs. 36 f.) xii. 31; Heb. ii. 1; vi. 16; ix. 11; Jas. iii. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 7; or the expression has become a current phrase, as οἱ πλείονες *the majority*
217 (in an assembly), Acts xix. 32; xxvii. 12; 1 Cor. ix. 19, etc. But
6th ed. sometimes the peculiar force of the Comparative recedes still farther from view; in such passages earlier expositors regarded the Comparative as put for the Positive[1] or Superlative: 2 Tim. i. 18 βέλτιον σὺ γινώσκεις thou knowest *better*, sc. than I (Lucian. pisc. 20 ἄμεινον σὺ οἶσθα ταῦτα); Acts xxv. 10 ὡς καὶ σὺ κάλλιον ἐπιγινώσκεις, *better* than thou art willing to appear to know it
257 (according to the supposition in verse 9 of his being guilty); 2 Cor. viii. 17 τὴν μὲν παράκλησιν ἐδέξατο, σπουδαιότερος δὲ ὑπάρχων *more*

[1] In Greek authors also the Comparative is not used for the Positive in sentences like Lucian. epp. Sat. 3, 32 τὸ ἥδιστον καὶ συμποτικώτερον καὶ ἰσοτιμία, etc., or 11 ὃς ἂν μεγαλοφωνότερος αὐτῶν ἦν καὶ θρασύτερος, Her. 2, 46 etc. (*Heusing.* Plut. educ. p. 3). Cf. also *Heinichen*, Euseb. H. E. 1. 210 sq.; *Herm.* Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 284.

eager sc. than to require an exhortation; vii. 7 ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι *more* sc. than for the (mere) arrival of Titus (verse 6), 228
cf. verse 13; Acts xxvii. 13 ἆσσον παρελέγοντο τὴν Κρήτην *nearer* 7th ed.
sc. than (verse 8) it had been possible; Phil. ii. 28 σπουδαιοτέρως ἔπεμψα αὐτόν sc. than I should have done, had you not been made uneasy by the news of his illness (verse 26); i. 12 τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν *more* (rather) *for the advancement* sc. than, as we feared, for the hinderance; Jno. xiii. 27 ὃ ποιεῖς ποίησον τάχιον more quickly than thou seemest disposed to do, hasten the execution, see Lücke in loc. (Senec. Agamn. 965 *citius* interea mihi edissere, ubi sit gnatus, cf. *ocius* Virg. Aen. 8, 554). In 1 Tim. iii. 14 τάχιον (ἐλπίζων ἐλθεῖν πρός σε τάχιον) is generally rendered as the Positive (ἐν τάχει Lchm. is a correction), while some take it as equivalent to ὡς τάχιστα. The meaning is: I write this to thee, hoping (though I hope) to come to thee more quickly, sooner i.e. than thou wilt need these instructions. The reason of his writing notwithstanding, is contained in ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνω etc., cf. verse 15. Heb. xiii. 19 *that I may be restored to you sooner* (than would be the case without your prayers);[1] xiii. 23 *if he come sooner* (than the date of my departure); Rom. xv. 15 τολμηρότερον ἔγραψα ὑμῖν *more boldly* (frankly) sc. than, from your Christian attainment (verse 14), was necessary. On Mark ix. 42 see Fr. in loc. Acts xviii. 26 does not require explanation. In 1 Cor. vii. 38 the relation between the Positive καλῶς ποιεῖ and the Comparative κρεῖσσον ποιεῖ is plain from verse 36 f. Likewise περισσοτέρως, so much used by Paul, never occurs without a comparison. Its comparative force is obvious in 2 Cor. i. 12; ii. 4; vii. 13; xi. 23; Phil. i. 14; Gal. i. 14; Heb. ii. 1; vi. 17; but in 1 Thess. ii. 17 περισσ. ἐσπουδάσαμεν τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν etc., the ground of the comparison lies probably in the clause: ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας. The being deprived of their personal intercourse for a time (which Paul calls *being bereaved*), had made his desire stronger than it would have been had he sustained no such relation to them. In 2 Pet. i. 19 the comparative 218
force of βεβαιότερον can be determined only on hermeneutical 6th ed.
grounds; but the discordance even of the most recent expositors, shows how occult the reference here is. On the other hand, there can be little doubt that in 2 Pet. ii. 11 after μείζονες "than those 258
τολμηταὶ αὐθάδεις" ought to be supplied. On Eph. iv. 9 see Mey.

[1] *Böhme*, who expresses the meaning of the passage correctly in his translation, affirms nevertheless in his comments: *non est comparat. stricte intelligendus.*

Acts xvii. 21 λέγειν τι καὶ ἀκούειν καινότερον is peculiarly characteristic. The Comparative indicates that they desired to hear something *newer* (than even what was deemed *new*), and is well fitted to portray the thirst of the Athenians after news. Generally, however, the Greeks employed the Comparative (usually νεώτερον) in asking the news; thus denoting not merely something new (Positive), but something still more fresh than what
229 had, up to that moment, been news; Her. 1, 27; Eurip. Orest. 1327;
7th ed. Aristoph. av. 254; Theophr. ch. 8, 1; Lucian. asin. 41; D. Sic. Exc. Vat. p. 24; Plat. Protag. 310 b. and Euthyphr. c. 1, see Stallb. in loc.

In Matt. xviii. 1 (Mark ix. 34; Luke ix. 46; xxii. 24) τῶν ἄλλων at once suggests itself as the ellipsis (μέγιστος would have implied three grades of four even among the Twelve; Ramshorn, lat. Gr. 316). In the same way, in Matt. xi. 11 ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τ. οὐρ., that is, ὁ μικρότερος (τῶν) ἄλλων (the Comparative appears to be chosen here as corresponding to the preceding μείζων), cf. Diog. L. 6, 5 ἐρωτηθεὶς τί μακαριώτερον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, ἔφη, εὐτυχοῦντα ἀποθανεῖν, Bauer, glossar. Theod. 455; Boisson. Philostr. 491. Other expositors after μικρότερος understand Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ; see, in general, Mey. Likewise in Acts xvii. 22 κατὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ the particle ὡς does not appear to belong to the Comparative as an intensive, but the passage must be rendered: In all respects (at every step, as it were) I behold you as more religious people (than others are, sc. ἄλλων; the Athenians as is well known were reputed to be such; see the expositors in loc.). The word θεωρῶ was designedly chosen, compare verse 23; and θεωρεῖν ὡς, though unusual, can hardly be considered as improper.

Note 1. When it is asserted that πρῶτος is used for the Comparative (πρότερος) where only two are spoken of e.g. Rev. xxi. 1 εἶδον οὐρανὸν καινὸν ... ὁ γὰρ πρῶτος οὐρανός etc. *prius* coelum, Heb. x. 9 ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον στήσῃ, Matt. xxi. 36 ἀπέστειλεν ἄλλους δούλους πλείονας τῶν πρώτων, Acts i. 1; 1 Cor. xiv. 30, the assertion is true only from a Latin point of view, for the Greeks are accustomed, even when there is a distinct reference to two only, to employ πρῶτος, δεύτερος, not πρότερος, ὕστερος (cf. Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 38), just as with us *the former*, *the latter* belong rather to the language of books than to that of the people. Likewise πρῶτος with the Genitive, as in Jno. i. 15, 30 πρῶτός μου (cf. Ael. anim. 8, 12), and the Adverb xv. 18 πρῶτον ὑμῶν, is properly not *prior me*, *prius vobis;* but the Superlative merely includes the Comparative, as is remarked by Hm. on Eurip. Med. ed. Elmsley, p. 343: Graecos ibi superlativum pro compar. dicere, ubi haec duo simul indicare volunt, et maius
219 quid esse alio et omnino maximum. Cf. also Fr. Rom. II. 421, not. It
6th ed. is an entire mistake when in Luke ii. 2 αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο
259 ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου, even recent expositors take πρώτη for προτέρα and make the Genitive ἡγεμον. etc. dependent on this Comparative: *took place before Q. was governor.* On this view Luke's language is not

only ambiguous (for the rendering: this took place as the first under the administration of Q. presents itself as the most obvious and natural), but also awkward if not ungrammatical. And Huschke (über d. zur Zeit d. Geburt J. Chr. gehalt. Census. Bresl. 1840, 8vo.) has not succeeded in adducing a really similar construction; he merely proves (what everybody admits) that πρῶτος is followed by the Genitive of a noun. The error of Tholuck (Glaubwürdigk. d. evang. Geschichte, S. 184) in regarding Jer. 230
xxix. 2 in the Sept. as parallel, has been exposed by Fr., as above. 7.h ed.

Note 2. Two Comparatives which are correlative, as in Rom. ix. 12 ὁ μείζων δουλεύσει τῷ ἐλάσσονι (Sept.), cf. 1 Cor. xii. 22; 2 Cor. xii. 15; Phil. i. 23 sq., or joined with a word expressing proportion, as in Heb. i. 4 τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα (x. 25), require no explanation. Cf. Xen. C. 7, 5, 7; Mem. 1, 4, 10; Plato, Apol. 39 d.

In the N. T. no instance occurs of two Comparatives connected by ἤ (Krü. 77). On the other hand, we find Positives with μᾶλλον in 2 Tim. iii. 4 φιλήδονοι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλόθεοι.

5. Sometimes, in comparative sentences, a part is compared not with the corresponding part but with the whole (Bhdy. 432); as, Jno. v. 36 μαρτυρίαν μείζω τοῦ Ἰωάννου, *witness greater than John*, that is, greater than that of John; so Her. 2, 134 πυραμίδα καὶ οὗτος ἀπελείπετο πολλὸν ἐλάσσω τοῦ πατρός, i.e. than that of his father; and Lucian. salt. 78 τὰ δι' ὀμμάτων φαινόμενα πιστότερα εἶναι τῶν ὤτων δοκεῖ. There is here no proper ellipsis (as the earlier philologists supposed); for had the speaker's thought coincided exactly with ours, he would have said τῆς τοῦ Ἰ., τῆς τοῦ πατρός,[1] etc. Rather must we regard the construction in question as a condensed form of expression quite in accordance with the genius of the Greek language, and of frequent occurrence, not merely with strict Comparatives (Hm. Vig. 717; Schaef. Melet. 127; Mtth. 1016), but also in other comparative sentences; Franke, Demosth. p. 90; Weber, Demosth. p. 399; Fr. Conjectan. I. 1 sqq. and Mr. p. 147, see § 63. In Latin, cf. Juven. 3, 74 sermo promptus et *Isaeo torrentior*, Cic. ad Brut. 1, 12; Orat. 1, 44, and in Hebrew. 260
Isa. lvi. 5 (1 Esdr. iii. 5). Matt. v. 20 ἐὰν μὴ περισσεύσῃ ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη πλεῖον τῶν γραμματέων etc. may also be explained in this way without violence; (Jesus could speak of a δικαιοσ. γραμμ., for their conduct assumed for itself this title of honor, and was looked up to and esteemed by the people as צדקה). On the other hand, 1 Cor i. 25 τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφώτερον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, is

[1] Only when several such parallel clauses follow each other is the Article omitted in the last; as, Plat. Gorg. 455 e. ἡ τῶν λιμένων κατασκευὴ ἐκ τῆς Θεμιστοκλέους ξυμβουλῆς γέγονε, τὰ δ' ἐκ τῆς Περικλέους, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ τῶν δημιουργῶν. Cf. *Siebelis*, Pausan. IV. 291.

220 easily accounted for without the usual (but forced) solution (Pott,
6th ed. Heydenreich, Flatt, in loc.) : *the foolishness of God is wiser than men* (are) ; that is, what appears foolishness in God's arrangements is not only wisdom, but is even wiser than men, outshines all the wisdom of men.

231 § 36. SUPERLATIVE.
7th ed.

1. Instead of the Superlative, we find, in elevated style, one instance of the Positive accompanied by a generic substantive: Luke i. 42 *εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν*, *blessed* (art) *thou among women*. This is primarily a Hebrew idiom (Gesen. Lg. 692) which strictly means: Among women thou art the (only) one that can be called *blessed*, the blessedness of others cannot be compared to thine ; hence, with rhetorical emphasis, *highly blessed*. This is not without parallel in Greek poetry (though the passages adduced by Kühnöl are not appropriate) ; as, Eurip. Alcest. 473 *ὦ φίλα γυναικῶν* (*ὦ φιλτάτα*) see Monk in loc., Aristoph. ran. 1081 *ὦ σχέτλι' ἀνδρῶν*, still more Pind. Nem. 3, 80 (140) *αἰετὸς ὠκὺς ἐν πετανοῖς*, cf. also Himer. orat. 15, 4 *οἱ γενναῖοι τῶν πόνων*, and Jacobs, Ael. anim. II. 400. The case is different in Matt. xxii. 36 *ποία ἐντολὴ μεγάλη ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ; which kind of commandment is great in the law?* so that others seem insignificant in comparison, — not precisely the *greatest*, see BCrus. in loc. Likewise in Luke x. 42 *τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο*, the Positive is not put for the Superlative ; the meaning is: She has chosen the *good* part (in reference to the kingdom of heaven ; that which alone truly deserves *this* name) ; Fr. Conject. I. 19 is in error. Matt. v. 19 *ὃς δ' ἂν ποιήσῃ ... οὗτος μέγας κληθήσεται* will be called *great*, a great one, not ex-
261 actly *the greatest* (opposed to *ἐλάχιστος* which precedes.) Cf. Hm. Aeschyl. p. 214.

2. Of the well-known Hebrew mode of expressing the Superlative, קֹדֶשׁ קָדָשִׁים, עֶבֶד עֲבָדִים, only the following examples occur in the N. T.: Heb. ix. 3 *ἡ (λεγομένη) ἅγια ἁγίων the most holy place* (which, however, as it had already assumed the character of a standing designation, scarcely comes under this head), Rev. xix. 16 *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων*, *κύριος κυρίων*, *the highest* king, lord, 1 Tim. vi. 15. But none of these expressions is a pure Hebraism ; in the Greek poets also we find such a doubling of adjectives (used substantively): Soph. Electr. 849 *δειλαία δειλαίων*, Oed. R. 466 *ἄῤῥητ' ἀῤῥήτων*, Soph. Phil. 65, *κακὰ κακῶν* Soph. Oed. C. 1238, see

Bhdy. 154; Wex, Antig. I. 316. The phrase *βασιλεὺς βασιλέων* too, is very simple, and more emphatic than *ὁ μέγιστος βασιλευς*; cf. Aeschyl. suppl. 524 *ἄναξ ἀνάκτων*, and, even as a technical designation, Theophan. contin. 127, 387 *ὁ ἄρχων τῶν ἀρχόντων*. See also Hm. Aesch. p. 230; Georgi, vind. 327 and Nova Biblioth. Lubec. II. 111 sq. In reference to the kindred expression *οἱ αἰῶνες τῶν αἰώνων*, see the passages in the concordance.

3. What were formerly adduced[1] as Hebraistic circumlocutions for the Superlative, are for the most part either, 221 6th ed.

a. Figurative expressions which appear in all languages (and the explanation of which in the present comes under the department of N. T. Rhetoric); e.g. Heb. iv. 12 *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον*, Matt. xvii. 20 *ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως* the *least* faith, iv. 16 *καθημένοις ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου* in the *darkest* shadow. Cf. Matt. xxviii. 3; Rev. i. 14; xviii. 5. Or, 232 7th ed.

b. Constructions which have nothing to do with the Superlative; as, Col. ii. 19 *αὔξησις τοῦ θεοῦ* not a *divine*, i.e. extraordinary, increase, but God's increase, i.e. not merely acceptable to God, but produced by God (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 6); 2 Cor. i. 12 *ἐν ἁπλότητι καὶ εἰλικρινείᾳ θεοῦ* not perfect sincerity, but sincerity which God effects, produces; Jas. v. 11 *τέλος κυρίου* not glorious end, but the 262
end which the Lord reserved (for Job); Rev. xxi. 11 *πόλις ἔχουσα τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ* not *great* glory, but simply and strictly the glory (splendor) of God; see Ewald in loc.; 1 Thess. iv. 16 *σάλπιγξ θεοῦ* not *great* or *far-sounding* trumpet (*σάλπιγξ φωνῆς μεγάλης* Matt. xxiv. 31), but trumpet of God, i.e. trumpet *which sounds at God's command*, or less restrictedly (as it is without the Article) a trumpet as used in the service of God (in heaven); so also Rev. xv. 2 *κιθάραι τοῦ θεοῦ* harps of God, as they sound in heaven (*to the praise of God*), cf. 1 Chron. xvi. 42.

In Rom. i. 16 *δύναμις θεοῦ* means, as expositors have long been agreed, the power of God (power in which God works); and there

[1] See, especially, *Pasor*, Grammat. p. 298 sq. The Hebrew mode of expression גָּדוֹל גָּדוֹל is used likewise by the later Greek poets; see *Boisson.* Nic. Eugen. p. 134, 383. Cf. Sept. *σφόδρα σφόδρα* Exod. i. 12; Judith iv. 2. On the Rosetta inscription 19 we find *μέγας καὶ μέγας*. Essentially the same is the expression (*μικρὸν*) *ὅσον ὅσον* Heb. x. 37 *a very little while* (*Hm.* Vig. 726), literally, *little how very, how very!* In Greek authors it occurs with a substantive annexed, as in Aristoph. vesp. 213 *ὅσον ὅσον στίλην as big* (that is, as small) *as a drop;* hence it is used precisely like quantillum. The simple *ὅσον* occurs also with a limiting genitive in Arrian. Indic. 29, 15 *σπείρουσιν ὅσον τῆς χώρης*. The passages adduced by *Wetst.* and *Lösner* as parallel do not establish *ὅσον ὅσον*, but merely the simple *μικρὸν ὅσον*. On the other hand, cf. Isa. xxvi. 20.

is no ground for charging Bengel with having intended by his "magna et gloriosa" to countenance the Hebraism in question. He merely gives prominence, in his way, to two qualities which a *virtus dei* will exhibit, — referring to 2 Cor. x. 4. Lastly, *ἀστεῖος τῷ θεῷ* Acts vii. 20, used in reference to Moses, does not express the Superlative, so much as *intensity* rather; it is to be translated *fair for* (before, in the judgment of) *God*, that is, to be sure, admodum formosus (cf. 2 Cor. x. 4 and Sturz, Zonarae glossae sacrae P. II. Grimmae, 1820, 4to. p. 12 sqq.). In Hebrew לֵאלֹהִים and לִפְנֵי יְהוָה are used in precisely the same manner (Gesen. Lg.
233 695), cf. Gen. x. 9; Jon. iii. 3 (Sept. *πόλις μεγάλη τῷ θεῷ*). See
7th ed. Fischer, proluss. 231 sqq.; Wolle, de usu et abusu *αὐξήσεως* nomi-
222 num divinor. sacrae, in his comment. de parenthesi sacra, p. 143 sqq.;
6th ed. but the use of the *Dative* is not, in itself, to be esteemed a Hebraism, cf. Heind. Plat. Soph. 336; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 479 a.

Haab (S. 162) is quite mistaken in maintaining that even the word Χριστός, annexed to a substantive, merely gives intensity to its signification, e.g. Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 10 *ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ, ἐν Χριστῷ the most unquestionable truth.* So other expositors would understand Col. ii. 18 *θρησκεία τῶν ἀγγέλων* as cultus perfectissimus; cf. 2 Sam. xiv. 20 *σοφία ἀγγέλου.*

Note. The strengthening of the Superlative by *πάντων* (Weber, Demosth. p. 548) occurs in the N. T. only in Mark xii. 28 *πρώτη πάντων*, cf. Aristoph. av. 473.

263 § 37. NUMERALS.

1. In expressing the day of the week, *εἷς* is always used for the ordinal numeral *πρῶτος*, as Matt. xxviii. 1 *εἰς μίαν τῶν σαββάτων*, Mark xvi. 2 *πρωΐ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων*, Luke xxiv. 1; Jno. xx. 1, 19; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2. The passages which have been quoted as analogous from Greek authors, merely prove that *εἷς* is used of the first member in divisions and enumerations (Weber, Demosth. p. 161), when *δεύτερος* or *ἄλλος*, or the like, follows; as, Her. 4, 161; Thuc. 4, 115; Herod. 6, 5, 2 sqq. (Georgi, vindic. 54 sqq.).[1] In this case *εἷς* no more stands for *πρῶτος* than in Latin unus, when followed by alter, tertius, etc., stands for primus (cf. also Rev. ix. 12 with xi. 14 and Gal. iv. 24). In the quotation from Her. 7, 11, 8 *εἷς* retains its proper signification, *unus*, and probably also in Paus. 7, 20, 1, where Sylb. renders it by *una*.[2]

[1] Also *Foertsch*, observ. in Lysiam p. 37, has been able to adduce only passages of this kind. On Diog. L. 8, 20 see *Lobeck*, Aglaopham. p. 429.

[2] *Chishull*, antiq. asiat. p. 159, translates *μιᾷ τῆς βουλῆς*: die concilii *prima*.

The preceding use of the numeral is Hebraistic (Ewald, krit. Gr. 496; on the Talmud, see Wetsten. I. 544; in the Sept. cf. Exod. xl. 2; Num. i. 1, 18; Ezra x. 16 f.; 2 Macc. xv. 36) and has in classical Greek a parallel in compound numerals; as, εἷς καὶ τριηκοστός (Her. 5, 89) *one and thirtieth*. We, too, use in like manner the cardinal numeral in giving the year, page, etc. mainly for brevity's sake, as *in the year eighteen*, *page forty*, etc.

For the cardinal *one* the Singular of a substantive is sometimes used alone; as, Acts xviii. 11 ἐκάθισεν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἕξ (Joseph. antt. 15, 2, 3), Rev. xii. 14 τρέφεται ἐκεῖ καιρόν (but Jas. iv. 13). This, however, is not an ellipsis (cf. § 26, 1), as the number one is implied in the Singular. A similar usage is found in all languages. 234 7th ed.

2. In 2 Pet. ii. 5 we find an abbreviated use of the ordinal: ὄγδοον Νῶε . . . ἐφύλαξε *Noah as eighth*, i.e. with seven others. In the same way Plat. legg. 3. 695 c. λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἕβδομος, Plutarch. Pelop. c. 13 εἰς οἰκίαν δωδέκατος κατελθών, Appian. Pun. p. 12 (2 Macc. v. 27), cf. also Schaef. Plutarch. V. 57 and Demosth. I. 812. Greek authors usually add αὐτός; see Kypke II. 442; Mtth. 1037. 223 6th ed. 264

3. Cardinals when repeated assume a *distributive* signification; as, Mark vi. 7 δύο δύο ἤρξατο ἀποστέλλειν, *binos* misit, *in pairs*, two and two. Instead of this the Greeks say κατά or ἀνὰ δύο (Krü. 75); the latter[1] occurs, for instance, in Luke x. 1, and in Mark as above in Cod. D as a correction. This repetition is properly Hebraistic (see Gesen. Lg. 703; cf. Gen. vii. 3, 9, and thence Leo, Gramm. p. 11), and the simplest form of expressing distribution, cf. Lob. pathol. p. 184. Yet solitary instances of a similar usage occur in Greek (poetry), e.g. Aeschyl. Pers. 981 μυρία μυρία, i.e. κατὰ μυριάδας; and the combination in Mark vi. 39, 40 ἐπέταξεν αὐτοῖς ἀνακλῖναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια . . . ἀνέπεσον πρασιαὶ πρασιαί is analogous.

The following expressions are singular: ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος Rev. xxi. 21 and εἷς καθ' εἷς (or καθεῖς) Mark xiv. 19; Jno. viii. 9 (like ἓν καθ' ἕν), ὁ καθ' εἷς Rom. xii. 5 (3 Macc. v. 34), for which Greek authors, preserving the regimen, use καθ' ἕνα (1 Cor. xiv. 31; Eph. v. 33). Yet compare ἀνὰ τέσσαρες Plut. Aem. 32 (see, however, Held), εἷς καθεῖς (Bekker writes καθείς) Cedren. II. 698, 723, εἷς παρ' εἷς Leo, Tact. 7, 83 and simply καθεῖς Theophan. contin. p. 39 and 101, and other quotations from late writers in

[1] For this ἀνά the Syriac version always employs the repeated numeral, e.g. Mark vi. 40 ἀνὰ ἑκατόν ܡܐܐ ܡܐܐ, ܡܐܐ ܡܐܐ. On the other hand, we find in Act. apocryph. 92 ἀνὰ δύο δύο.

Wetst. I. 627, also Intpt. ad Lucian. Soloec. 9. In these phrases the preposition serves merely as an adverb; Hm. de partic. ἄν p. 5 sq. A different view is taken by Döderlein, Pr. de brachylogia serm. gr. et lat. (Erlang. 1831, 4to.) p. 10.

4. The well-known rule, that in combinations of numbers καί is commonly inserted when the smaller number precedes, but omitted when the greater precedes (Mtth. 339; cf. the Inscript. in Chishull, antiq. asiat. p. 69 sq.) cf. 1 Cor. x. 8; Jno. vi. 19; Acts i. 15; vii. 14; xxvii. 37; Rev. iv. 4; xix. 4,[1] ought not, particularly the latter part of it (Schoem. ad Isaeum 332; Krü. 74), to be taken too strictly; for there are exceptions to it everywhere, in the N. T. at least several undoubted ones: Jno. ii. 20 τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ἓξ ἔτεσιν (without var.), v. 5 τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη (according to preponderating authority), Gal. iii. 17; Luke xiii. 11, 16; Acts xiii. 20; Rev. xi. 2. Similar instances again and again occur in Greek authors; as, Her. 8, 1 εἴκοσι καὶ ἑπτά, Thuc. 1, 29 ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ πέντε, Dion. Hal. IV. 2090 ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ τρεῖς. In Sept. cf. 1 Kings ix. 28; xv. 10, 33; xvi. 23, 28; Gen. xi. 13 (in Judg. x. 4 Tdf. has given in one verse, τριάκοντα καὶ δύο υἱοὶ and τριάκοντα δύο πώλους).

5. When ἐπάνω is joined to a cardinal to denote *above, more than*, the cardinal does not stand in the Genitive after ἐπάνω, but is put in the case which the verb of the sentence requires; as, Mark xiv. 5 πραθῆναι ἐπάνω τριακοσίων δηναρίων, 1 Cor. xv. 6 ὤφθη ἐπάνω πεντακοσίοις ἀδελφοῖς. Precisely so (without a case) the Greeks use ἔλαττον Plato, legg. 9, 856 d. μὴ ἔλαττον δέκα ἔτη γεγονότας (Thuc. 6, 95), πλέον (Paus. 8, 21, 1), περί (Zosim. 2, 30), εἰς or ἐς (Appian. civil. 2, 96, but compare Sturz, Lex. Xen. II. 68), μέχρι (Aeschin. fals. leg. 37 ed. Bremi), ὑπέρ (Plut. virt. mul. 208, Lips.; Jos. antt. 18, 1, 5); see Lob. Phryn. 410 sq.; Gieseler in Rosenmüller's Repert. II. 139 ff.; Sommer in the allg. Schulzeit. 1831, S. 963. Latin constructions such as occisis *ad* hominum millibus quatuor, Caes. b. gall. 2, 33, from the historians, are well enough known.

Note 1. That the Neuters δεύτερον, τρίτον, etc., signify also *the second time, the third time*, etc., it is superfluous to remark. They are sometimes accompanied by τοῦτο, as τρίτον τοῦτο ἔρχομαι 2 Cor. xiii. 1 *this is the third time I come*, or, *now I am coming for the third time*, cf. Her. 5, 76 τέταρτον τοῦτο.

Note 2. For the numeral adverb ἑπτάκις we find the cardinal in Matt.

[1] Three numerals are sometimes found thus combined; as, Rev. vii. 4 ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες xiv. 3; xxi. 17; Jno. xxi. 11 ἑκ. πεντήκοντα τρεῖς.

xviii. 22 in the formula ἕως ἑβδομηκοντάκις ἑπτά *seventy times seven* (times), compare in Sept. Gen. iv. 24 and שִׁבְעָה Ps. cxix. 164 (for שֶׁבַע פְּעָמִים) Ewald 498. Taken strictly it means: seventy times (and) seven, that is, seventy-seven times; but this would not suit the passage. Moreover, that ἕως is not to be joined to ἑπτά but to ἑβδομηκ., appears from the preceding ἕως ἑπτάκις. (How variously numeral adverbs are expressed in the Sept. may be seen from the following passages: Exod. xxxiv. 23; Deut. xvi. 16; 2 Kings vi. 10; Neh. vi. 4; 2 Sam. xix. 43.)

CHAPTER IV.

236
7th ed.
266

THE VERB.

§ 38. ACTIVE AND MIDDLE VOICES.

1. As on the one hand the Active voice of transitive verbs not infrequently assumes also an intransitive (apparently reflexive) signification, so on the other many intransitive verbs have become transitives (causatives);— 225
6th ed.

Sometimes in consequence of composition, as διαβαίνειν Heb. xi. 29, παρέρχεσθαι Luke xi. 42; and sometimes by simple adaptation, as μαθητεύειν τινά[1] Matt. xxviii. 19 (θριαμβεύειν τινά 2 Cor. ii. 14 ?), βασιλεύειν τινά 1 Sam. viii. 22; 1 Kings i. 43; Isa. vii. 6; 1 Macc. viii. 13 (Lob. Soph. Aj. 385). See § 32, 1, pp. 221 sqq.

Those transitive verbs which are frequently or even generally employed as intransitive, are restricted to certain classes of meanings that may be easily gathered from the following examples: ἄγειν (ἄγωμεν let us go), παράγειν Matt. xx. 30; 1 Cor. vii. 31, περιάγειν Acts xiii. 11, βάλλειν Acts xxvii. 14 (precipitate itself, rush), ἐπιβάλλειν Mark iv. 37 (beat into), ἀποῤῥίπτειν Acts xxvii. 43 (throw themselves off), κλίνειν Luke ix. 12 (incline itself, decline), ἐκκλίνειν Rom. xvi. 17, ἀνατέλλειν, βλαστάνειν, αὐξάνειν (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 89 sq. 382 sqq.), στρέφειν Acts vii. 42, ἀναστρέφειν Acts v. 22 (return), and especially ἐπιστρέφειν; ἐκτρέπειν, παραδιδόναι Mark iv. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 23 (commit, consign one's self), ἀπέχειν be at a distance, ἐπέχειν Acts xix. 22 (hold one's self back, i.e. stay), ὑπερέχειν, σπεύδειν. In the N. T. ἀνακάμπτειν, προκόπτειν are only intransitive. In all these cases (which are

[1] Here belongs also προστάττειν τινά *to commission one*, Acta apocr. p. 172.

for the most part verbs of motion) the Greeks considered nothing as omitted (not even ἑαυτόν), but the verb denotes the action absolutely: *he plunges*, Germ. stürzt, *into the sea, he turns;* where, however, as no object is mentioned, the reader can only refer the action back to the subject. See, in general, Bos, Ellips. p. 127 sqq.; Mtth. 1100 ff.; Bhdy. 339 f.; Krü. 134 f.; Poppo, Thuc. I. 186; Fr. Mr. p. 138. On διδόναι and its compounds in particular, see Jacobs, Philostr. p. 363, and on παρέχειν Ast, Plat. polit. p. 470; Wyttenb. Plut. mor. 1, 405.

267 Jno. xiii. 2 τοῦ διαβόλου βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν must not be referred to this head, whether the received reading or that adopted by Lchm. and Tdf. be followed; βάλλειν has in any case an Active signification; see Kypke.

237 7th ed. Many verbs have some of their tenses transitive (causative), and some intransitive. So ἵστημι with its compounds (Bttm. II. 207), of which it is sufficient to remark, that the 1st Aor. Pass. σταθῆναι Mark iii. 24 and the 1st. Fut. σταθήσομαι Matt. xii. 25, 46 share the intransitive meaning *stand*, and that in Acts xxvii. 28 the 1st Aor. διαστήσαντες [after which ναῦν or ἑαυτούς is not with Bttm. (Gramm. des neutest. Sprachgebr. p. 41.) to be supplied] signifies *stood off;* (cf. Malal. 2 p. 35 στήσας for στάς). In Heb. xii. 15 Sept. φύειν even in the Pres. is intransitive (Iliad. 6, 149).

In 1 Pet. ii. 6 περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ *is contained* (stands) in the Scripture, περιέχει appears to have rather a passive than an intransitive signification; cf. Joseph. antt. 11, 4, 7; Malal. 9, 216; 18, 449; see Krebs, observ. 198.

On the impersonal use of certain verbs (in 3d pers. Sing.), as βροντᾷ, λέγει, φησί, see § 58, 9, p. 522.

226 6th ed. 2. The Middle Voice (of transitive verbs)[1] refers back the action to the acting subject, either

[1] See *L. Küster*, de vero usu verborum medior. ap. Graecos, and *J. Clerici*, diss. de verbis Graecor. mediis, both reprinted in the work of *Dresig*, to which we refer below. *Hm.* emend. rat. p. 178; *Bhdy.* 342 ff.; *Rost*, 562 ff.; *Krü.* 140 ff. are more philosophic. Especially cf. *Poppo*, Progr. de Graecor. verbis mediis, passivis, deponentibus rite discernendis. Frcf. a. V. 1827, 4to., and *Mehlhorn's* critique on it in *Jahn's* Jahrb. 1831, I. 14 ff.; *Sommer* in *Jahn's* Jahrb. 1831, II. 36 ff.; *J. H. Kistemaker*, de origine ac vi verbor. depon. et medior. gr. ling. in the Classical Journal No. 44 (Dec. 1820), No. 45 (March 1821). A monograph on this subject in reference to the N. T. is, *S. F. Dresigii* commentar. de verbis med. N. T. nunc prim. editus cura *J. F. Fischeri*. Lips. (1755) 1762, 8vo. On the whole, however, scholars have hitherto represented too many verbs as middle; a great many such verbs, on account of the *constant* use of their Aorist Passive, may be fairly regarded as passive, since in Greek as well as in Latin the passive may be used as reflexive. Thus in κινέομαι, ἐγείρομαι, διακονεῖσθαι, ἁγνίζεσθαι, μεθύσκεσθαι, δογματίζεσθαι (Col. ii. 20), ἀτιμάζεσθαι *Fr.* (Rom. I. 72), συσχηματίζεσθαι, the thought is undoubtedly passive, not middle, as *moveri* etc. in Latin. Under this head come still more appropriately ὀρέγεσθαι (*appetitu ferri*), βόσκεσθαι *pasci*, etc.; also αἰσχύνεσθαι. Compare, in general, *Rost's* preface to the third edition of his Greek Dictionary, p. 9 sq and his Gramm. p. 270. *Sommer*, as above.

a. Simply as the immediate object, as λούομαι *I wash myself*, κρύπτομαι *I conceal myself* Jno. viii. 59, ἀπάγχομαι *I hang myself* Matt. xxvii. 5, παρασκενάζομαι 1 Cor. xiv. 8;[1] or,

b. Mediately, in case the action is done *to* or in any way *for* the 268
subject; as, ἐξαγοράζομαι *I buy for myself*, προέχομαι *I hold before myself* (Fr. Rom. I. 171), νίπτομαι τὰς χεῖρας *I wash for myself the hands, my hands* Mark vii. 3, σπάομαι τὴν μάχαιραν xiv. 47, εἰσκαλοῦμαι Acts x. 23 *I call in to myself*, ἀπωθέομαι *I push away for* 238
myself (from me). Compare besides περιποιεῖσθαι, κομίζεσθαι, 7th ed.
καταρτίζεσθαι, ἐπικαλεῖσθαι (θεόν) Fr. Rom. II. 403, and the following passages: Matt. vi. 17; Luke vi. 7; x. 11; Acts v. 2 f.; ix. 39; xviii. 18; xix. 24; xxv. 11; Gal. iv. 10; 1 Pet v. 5; 2 Thess. iii. 14; Heb. x. 5.

Sometimes a verb is used in the Active voice of material, and in the Middle of mental objects; as, καταλαμβάνειν *to seize*, καταλαμβάνεσθαι *to comprehend*, ἀνατιθέναι *put up*, ἀνατίθεσθαι *to propound*; probably also διαβεβαιοῦσθαι 1 Tim. i. 7; Tit. iii. 8; cf. Aristot. rhet. 2, 13. On προβλέπεσθαι see below, 6, p. 258.

At other times a new signification grows out of the Middle, as πείθομαι *I persuade myself* i.e. *obey*, ἀπολύομαι *solvo me* i.e. *discedo*, παύομαι *I cease*, φυλάσσομαί τινα *I guard one in reference to myself* i.e. I beware of him;[2] thoroughly transitive are παραιτοῦμαί τι (I deprecate something *in my own behalf*) *I decline*, αἱροῦμαι I 227
take for *myself*, *I choose*, ἀπειπάμην τι *I renounced* 2 Cor. iv. 2, 6th ed
ἐκτρέπομαί τι 1 Tim. vi. 20, ἀποδίδομαί τι (I give away something *from myself*) *I sell* something, ἀποκρίνομαι (I give out a decision *from myself*) *I answer*, ἐπικαλοῦμαι καίσαρα Acts xxv. 11 (I call upon the emperor *in my behalf*) *I appeal to*. So λυτρόω properly

[1] What verbs regularly express this reflexive meaning by the Middle must be learned from observation. In many (we should rather say in most, see *Rost* 563), the reflexive sense is never expressed by the Middle, but by the reflexive pronoun ἑαυτόν etc. subjoined, see *Bttm.* 122, 2. Thus in Matt. viii. 4 δεικνύειν ἑαυτόν is used to denote *show himself*, cf. Her. 3, 119; ἀποκτείνειν ἑαυτόν is always employed to express *kill himself* (Jno. viii. 22); cf. further, Jno. xxi. 18; 1 Cor. iii. 18; 2 Thess ii. 4; 1 Jno. i. 8 (in contrast with a passive Matt. xxiii. 12; 1 Cor. xi. 31, or an active Luke ix. 25; xxiii. 35), see *Küster*, de verb. med. p. 56. Lexicographers should no longer defer an accurate investigation of the subject. See also *Poppo* as above, p. 2, note; *Krü.* 146.

[2] Φυλάσσεσθαι as a Middle means also *sibi* (*aliquid*) *custodire* (*Heind.* Plat. Gorg. p. 323), and was used of that which one retains in his mind, by Hesiod. op. 263, 561. On the other hand, in the sense of (*legem*) *sibi observare*, as in Luke xviii. 21 according to the reading of several Codd. (ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητος), it probably does not occur in classical Greek, but frequently in the Sept. Yet in Luke xviii. 21 the better reading [sustained by Cod. Sin. also] is ἐφύλαξα.

means I liberate, acting as master; but λυτροῦμαι I liberate *for myself* another's captive, Luke xxiv. 21.

When such Middle verb is construed with the accusative of any thing or quality belonging to the subject, the pronoun is sometimes in the N. T. added to the substantive; as, Matt. xv. 2 οὐ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν, Rom. ix. 17 ὅπως ἐνδείξωμαι ἐν σοὶ τὴν δύναμίν μου (in Greek authors ἐπιδείκνυμαι is often so used, Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 9; Schoem. ad
239 Plutarch. Agid. p. 144), Acts vii. 58 ἀπέθεντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν (where Tdf. without sufficient authority omits the pronoun), Heb. vi. 17; Eph. ii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 19. In such instances the pronoun is redundant, and Greek authors usually dispense with it, which the N. T. writers also frequently do, as in Acts ix. 39; Mark vii. 3; xiv. 47.

By the usage under b. is likewise 2 Cor. iii. 18 ἡμεῖς πάντες ... τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτριζόμενοι to be explained: as it were *sibi* intueri, beholding (for ourselves) the glory of the Lord (as in a mirror), like Philo II. 107. In Rom. iii. 25 ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς etc., recent expositors have likewise taken notice of the Middle; yet Philippi seems to have reached the true exposition more nearly than Fr.

3. Finally, c. the Middle frequently denotes an action that takes place by order or with the permission of the subject, — a relation
239 expressed in German by the auxiliary verb (*sich*) *lassen*, and in
7th ed. Latin usually by *curare* (cf. Sommer in Seebode, krit. Biblioth. 1828, II. 733); as, ἀδικεῖσθαι to *allow* one's self to be wronged, and ἀποστερεῖσθαι to *allow* one's self to be robbed (both in 1 Cor. vi. 7), ἀπογράφεσθαι to *allow* one's self to be registered, *get* enrolled Luke ii. 1. Cf. further βαπτίζεσθαι, γαμεῖσθαι, and many others. Examples of Middle verbs that in this case, too, assume a new and independent transitive signification, are: δανείζομαι pecuniam mutuo dandam sibi curare i.e. *mutuam sumere* Matt. v. 42, μισθοῦμαι allow something to be hired out to one's self i.e. *hire* Matt. xx. 1.

In some Middle verbs the *reciprocal* meaning is combined with the reflexive (Krü. 143); as, βουλεύεσθαι *to consult with one another* Jno. xii. 10, συντίθεσθαι *to settle, agree, among themselves* Jno. ix. 22, κρίνεσθαι *be at law, have a lawsuit* 1 Cor. vi. 1 (in the quotation from the O. T. in Rom. iii. 4 also?).

4. Although the import of the Middle is sharply defined and peculiar, yet in practice, even among the best Greek authors, the forms of the Middle often blend with those of the Passive; — not merely,

a. That those tenses which have no separate form in the Middle are borrowed from the Passive (the Present, Imperf., Perf., Pluperf.,

see Bttm. I. 368), and that the 1st Aor. Passive in several verbs 228
serves at the same time as 1st Aor. Middle, as in φοβεῖσθαι, 6th ed.
κοιμᾶσθαι, πορεύεσθαι, ἁγνίζεσθαι (Acts xxi. 24, 26; cf. also § 39, 2); but

b. Some tenses peculiar to the Middle assume a Passive signification. These are the Future (Monk, Eurip. Hippol. p. 169, Lips.; Boisson. Eunap. p. 336; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 192; Stallb. Plat. Crit. 16 and rep. II. 230; Isocrat. Areopag. ed. Benseler, p. 229; Weber, Demosth. p. 353);[1] and, though far more rarely and, 270
especially in prose, not beyond question, the Aorist (d'Orville, Charit. p. 358; Abresch, Aristaen. p. 178; Mtth. 1107 and ad Eurip. Hel. 42; yet cf. Schaef. Gnom. 166; Lob. 320).

This usage, it has been thought, occurs in the N. T.: Gal. v. 12 ὄφελον καὶ ἀποκόψονται οἱ ἀναστατοῦντες ὑμᾶς, yet here the Middle affords a very good sense (see my Com. in loc.); 1 Cor. x. 2 καὶ πάντες ἐβαπτίσαντο, which, however, (see Mey.) may be very suitably rendered: *they all allowed themselves to be baptized* (the reading ἐβαπτίσθησαν, which is found in very good Codd. [Sin. also], is probably an emendation); the same applies to 1 Cor. vi. 11 ἀπελούσασθε. In Acts xv. 22 ἐκλεξαμένους, even if it were to be joined to ἄνδρας, would not be equivalent to ἐκλεχθέντας (see Kühnöl in loc.; Schwarz, Comm. p. 499), but would retain the Middle signification: who *suffered* themselves to be chosen, who 240
(voluntarily) accepted the mission; (ἐκλεχθέντας would mean: 7th ed.
who were chosen, even *without their consent*).[2] But it is more probable that ἐκλεξαμένους should be referred to ἀπόστολοι and πρεσβύτεροι, and translated: *after they had chosen from among themselves persons;* see Elsner, observ. I. 429. Cf. § 63, I. 1, p. 567.

5. The Active is sometimes employed in Greek authors where the Middle form might have been expected, (Poppo, Thuc. I. 1. 185; Locella, Xen. Eph. p. 233; Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 161; Siebelis, Pausan. I. 5; Weber, Demosth. 252 sq.). From the N. T., however, the following passage has been erroneously referred to this head: 2 Cor. xi. 20 εἴ τις ὑμᾶς καταδουλοῖ if one brings you into bondage unto himself (sibi) (Gal. ii. 4, Middle as a var.). The Apostle wished to say generally: *if he brings you into bondage*, makes you slaves. He speaks merely of enslavement; to *whom* and *how*,

[1] According to *Sommer*, as above, the Fut. Middle was itself, perhaps, originally Passive, and afterwards, on account of its more convenient form, preferred to the Fut. Pass. Cf. *Rost*, 561 f.

[2] So perhaps Plutarch, orator. vit. 7 (V. 149, Lips.) πιστευσάμενος τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν χρημάτων.

must be gathered from the context. Likewise, in Luke xii. 20 the Active is used with strict propriety: *ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ they require of thee* (where only the taking away of the *ψυχή* was to be expressed). On the other hand we sometimes find, at least in the text. recept., *ποιεῖν*, where classic Greek authors would have employed *ποιεῖσθαι*[1] (Küster, p. 37 sqq. 67 sqq.; Dresig, p. 401 sqq.;
229 Krü. 141), e.g. *συνωμοσίαν ποιεῖν* Acts xxiii. 13 (Polyb. 1, 70, 6;
8th ed. Herod. 7, 4, 7), *μονὴν ποιεῖν* Jno. xiv. 23 (Thuc. 1, 131 and Poppo),
271 *πρόθεσιν ποιεῖν* Eph. iii. 11;[2] but in the first two passages Lchm. has restored the Middle. Likewise *εὑρίσκειν* is used in the meaning of *consequi* for *εὑρίσκεσθαι*, see Fr. Mt. p. 390.[3]

241 Occasionally the Middle and Active are used interchangeably,[4]
7th ed. as Luke xv. 6 *συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους*, vs. 9 *συγκαλεῖται τὰς φίλας* etc. according to Lchm. (Tdf. has the Active here also);[5] it depended here on the writer (Franke, Demosth. p. 95), whether he would say, *called together to himself*, or generally, *called together*, — the latter being perfectly intelligible. Compare also Jas. iv. 2 f. *αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε*, 1 Jno. iii. 22; cf. v.

[1] In Mark ii. 23 *ὁδὸν ποιεῖν* (where Codd. vary) is probably not put for *ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι* Her. 7, 42 (according to *πορείαν ποιεῖσθαι* Luke xiii. 22), as the meaning *make a journey* is here rather unsuitable. The translation must be quite literal: they made by plucking ears a pathway in the field. *Lchm.* in accordance with his theory has printed *ὁδοποιεῖν*, after B.

[2] The Middle of *ποιεῖν* seldom occurs in the N. T. (almost exclusively in the Acts and Paul's Epistles), but then it always clearly exhibits a Middle signification. As the lexicons do not usually distinguish the Middle and Active, we shall here annex the phrases in which the Middle occurs: Acts i. 1 *τὸν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην*, viii. 2 *ἐποιήσαντο κοπετόν*, xxv. 17 *ἀναβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, xxvii. 18 *ἐκβολὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 16; 1 Thess. i. 2; Philem. 4 *μνείαν τινὸς ποιεῖσθαι*, 2 Pet. i. 15 *μνήμην τινὸς ποιεῖσθαι*, i. 10 *ἐκλογὴν ποιεῖσθαι βεβαίαν*, Jude 3 *σπουδὴν ποιεῖσθαι*, Phil. i. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1 *δέησιν ποιεῖσθαι*, Rom. xv. 26 *κοινωνίαν ποιεῖσθαι*, Eph. iv. 16 *τὸ σῶμα τὴν αὔξησιν ποιεῖται*, Heb. i. 3 *δι' ἑαυτοῦ καθαρισμὸν ποιησάμενος τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*. To illustrate Greek usage much has been collected by *Dresig*, p. 422 sqq; see also *V. Fritzsche*, Aristoph. I. 538 sq. The distinction between the Act. and the Mid. has been stated by *Blume*, ad Lycurg. p. 55, thus: Est *ποιεῖν*, quotiescunque accusativus substantivi abstracti accedit, *aliquid efficere, parare, faciendum curare, cause, bring to pass, institute*, *ποιεῖσθαι ipsum facere* cum substantivis junctum periphrasin facit verbi, quod aut notatione aut certe notione nomini apposito conveniat. (On *λόγον ποιεῖν* and *ποιεῖσθαι*, see *Weber*, Demosth. p. 295.)

[3] In Jno. v. 5 *ἦν ἄνθρωπος ... τριάκ. καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ* it cannot be said that *ἔχων* is put for *ἐχόμενος*. Rather might *ἔχειν ἐν ἀσθεν.* be considered as equivalent to *ἔχειν ἀσθενῶς (κακῶς)*. But according to verse 6 *ἔχων* is probably to be joined as transitive to *ἔτη*.

[4] The distinction between the Active and the Middle is forcibly marked e.g. in Dion. H. IV. 2088 *τόν τε ἀετὸν ἀνεσωσάμην, καὶ τὸν στρατοπεδάρχην ἔσωσα.*

[5] In the same way along with *καταλαμβάνεσθαι πόλιν*, etc. (*to capture, take possession of*), *καταλαμβάνειν πόλιν* is also used; cf. *Schweighäuser*, Lexic. Polyb. p. 330.

14 f.[1] See Mtth. 1096 (Foertsch, Lys. p. 39).[2] In 1 Cor. ix. 5 *περιάγεσθαι* might be more appropriate. *Περιάγειν τινά* signifies to lead about for exhibition, or to conduct, 2 Macc. vi. 10; Pol. 12, 4, 14; but to lead about *with one* (in one's company), is expressed by *περιάγεσθαι*. However, the Active is used perhaps in this sense in Xen. C. 2, 2, 28. Moreover, it would not be surprising that foreigners, not possessing in such matters the delicate perception of native Greeks, should sometimes fail to observe the precise shade of meaning conveyed by the Middle voice; particularly as, even among natives, its use appears to have often depended on the culture and taste of individual writers. *Καθάπτω*, an Active altogether peculiar to the later language (see Passow), stands for the Middle in Acts xxviii. 3 (yet not without var.). 272 230 6th ed

In such cases as Matt. xxvi. 65 *διέῤῥηξε τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ*, Acts xiv. 14, the expression *διεῤῥήξατο τὰ ἱμάτια* might also have been used in Greek, see above; yet the former is not an anomaly, Bhdy. 348. The distinction between *παρέχειν* and *παρέχεσθαι* (Rost, 564; Krü. 141; cf. Küster, No. 49) is not uniformly observed even by the Greeks; yet the suitableness of the Middle will be easily recognized in Acts xix. 24; Col. iv. 1; Tit. ii. 7, and in Acts xvi. 16 *ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρεῖχε τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς μαντευομένη* the Active is more appropriate than the Middle, as the writer is speaking of a gain which the damsel procured actually only, not designedly.

6. On the other hand, the Middle occurs with *ἑαυτῷ* Jno. xix. 24 *διεμερίσαντο ἑαυτοῖς* (for which we find in Matt. xxvii. 35 *διεμερίσαντο* alone), cf. Xen C. 1, 4, 13; 2, 1, 30; Lycurg. 11, 8; 17, 3, and with *ἑαυτόν*, instead of the Active with *ἑαυτόν* (Plat. Protag. p. 349a.; Blume, Lycurg. p. 90). In Tit. ii. 7 *σεαυτὸν παρεχόμενος τύπον* the use of the Middle in the sense of *show one's self* (in any mental or moral quality) was so established, that the writer employed it even where *σεαυτόν* (on account of *τύπον*) had to be distinctly expressed; cf. Xen. C. 8, 1, 39 *παράδειγμα ... τοιόνδε ἑαυτὸν παρείχετο*. For other examples of the Middle with *ἑαυτῷ*, *ἑαυτόν*, see Schaef. Dion. Hal. p. 88; Bornem. Xen. Anab. 76 sq.; Bhdy. 347; 242 7th ed

[1] In Mark xiv. 47 we find *σπασάμενος τὴν μάχαιραν*, but in Matt. xxvi. 51 *ἀπέσπασε τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ*.

[2] Under this head might be classed also those Actives, accompanied by the reflexive pronoun, for which the Middles are also actually in use in a reflexive sense; as, *ταπεινοῦν ἑαυτόν* Phil. ii. 8; Matt. xviii. 4 cf. *ταπεινοῦσθαι* Jas. iv. 10 (*Wetst.* II. 271), *δουλοῦν ἑαυτόν* 1 Cor. ix. 19, *ζωννύειν ἑαυτ.* Jno. xxi. 18, *γυμνάζειν ἑαυτ.* 1 Tim. iv. 7 etc. But in all these passages the reflexive pronoun is employed antithetically (*Krü.* 146), and in Jno. xxi. e.g. the Mid. would even be incorrect So *κείρειν ἑαυτ.* would mean, shear *himself*, *κείρεσθαι shear* himself. Besides, the Active with *ἑαυτόν* was probably chosen where the identity of the Passive and Middle forms would have occasioned ambiguity.

Mehlhorn, as above, 36; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 189; cf. also Epiphan. I. 380 ὁπλισάμενος ἑαυτόν. In Tit. i. 5 ἐπιδιορθώσῃ, according to the received text (where, however, better Codd. have ἐπιδιορθώσῃς), would be exactly equivalent to the Active. As little can a Middle signification be recognized in ἀπεκδύεσθαι Col. ii. 15, ἀμύνεσθαι
273 Acts vii. 24 (cf. Dion. H. I. 548), ἁρμόζεσθαι 2 Cor. xi. 2 (Lösner, Observ. p. 320 sq.). Perhaps also προέχεσθαι Rom. iii. 9 is used for the Active. Similar instances occur in later writers, Schaef. Plutarch. V. 101; Meineke, Index ad Cinnam. 244.[1] To this head are referred also Eph. v. 13 πᾶν τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστι, and i. 23 τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι πληρουμένου. But in the first passage φανεροῦσθαι occurs immediately before as a Passive, and the apostle continuing his argument connects φανερούμενον with
231 φανεροῦται; the former, therefore, must be taken in the same sense
6th ed. with the latter, as Harless and Mey. in loc. have explained: *all things when reproved are made manifest by the light, for everything that is made manifest is light.* In i. 23 πληρουμ. might also be taken in a Passive sense (as has been done by Holzhausen); but then, as Harless has well shown, τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι would create difficulty. I take πληροῦσθαι, therefore, as Middle (Xen. Hell. 5, 4, 56; 6, 2, 14; Demosth. Polycl. 707 b.), *the fulness of him who filleth all*, where the Middle signification is not entirely lost: *from himself, with himself*, he filleth all. Likewise in Heb. xi. 40 the Middle προβλέπεσθαι is employed correctly: προβλέπειν would be the bodily act of *seeing beforehand;* the Middle expresses the act of mental *providing.* (Similar is the distinction in Greek authors between προορᾶσθαι and προϊδέσθαι.)

A distinction between the use of the Act. and Mid. appears in the verb ἐνεργεῖν, the Active of which is used by Paul of personal action (1 Cor. xii. 6; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. i. 11, etc.), and the Middle of non-personal (Rom. vii. 5; Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. ii. 7, etc.). Hence in 1 Thess. ii. 13 ὅς must not be referred to θεός but to λόγος

243 7. From Middle verbs are to be carefully distinguished Deponent.
7th ed. These, under a Passive (or Middle) form, have a transitive or a neuter signification; and their Active forms either do not occur at all (in prose), or have, by usage, exactly the same meaning (Rost 267.);[2] as, δύνασθαι, δωρεῖσθαι, γίγνεσθαι, βιάζεσθαι, ἐντέλ-

[1] In the passages selected by *Schweighäuser*, Lexic. Herod. II. 185, the distinctive import of the Middle Voice can be for the most part detected.

[2] Only in later authors do we find e.g. the Active of λυμαίνεσθαι, see *Passow*. On the other hand, the Active of δωρεῖσθαι occurs even in Pindar, Olymp. 6, 131. In the N. T. we find even εὐαγγελίζω, as frequently in the Sept.

λεσθαι, εὔχεσθαι, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, ἐργάζεσθαι, εὐλαβεῖσθαι, μάχεσθαι, μέμφεσθαι, φείδεσθαι, ἀσπάζεσθαι, ἔρχεσθαι, ἡγεῖσθαι, ἰᾶσθαι, λογίζεσθαι, προαιτιᾶσθαι, and many others. With regard to Deponents 274
it must be remarked that,

a. Though most of them have in the Aorist the Middle form (Middle Deponents, as αἰτιᾶσθαι, ἀσπάζεσθαι, ἐργάζεσθαι, φείδεσθαι), yet not a few have in that tense the Passive (Passive Deponents), as βούλεσθαι, δύνασθαι, ἐπιμελεῖσθαι, εὐλαβεῖσθαι, σπλαγχνίζεσθαι, μωμᾶσθαι, etc.

b. Others combine both forms, though then (in prose) either the one form or the other predominates. Among these is ἀρνεῖσθαι, on which (in opposition to Bttm.) see Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 209. In the N. T. only its Aor. Mid. ἠρνησάμην occurs, which in Greek prose authors is precisely the rarer form. On the other hand, διαλέγεσθαι has always the Passive Aor. in biblical Greek.

c. Sometimes in Middle Deponents, along with the Aor. (or Perf.) Mid. (with an Active signification), the Aor. or the Perf. Pass. with a Passive signification is in use; as, ἐθεάθην Matt. vi. 1; Mark xvi. 11 (Thuc. 3, 38) cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 594 sq., along with ἐθεασάμην I *saw*; ἰάθην Matt. viii. 13; Luke vi. 17 (Isa. liii. 5; Plat. legg. 6, 758 d.) and ἴαμαι Mark v. 29 (on the other hand, 232
ἰασάμην Active); ἐλογίσθην often (cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 33), ἀπεδέχθησαν 6th ed.
Acts xv. 4 (Aor. Mid. Luke viii. 40; Acts xviii. 27) cf. 2 Macc. iii. 9., παρητημένος Luke xiv. 19 (Aor. Mid. Heb. xii. 19, 25), ἐῤῥύσθην 2 Tim. iv. 17 (Aor. Mid. Col. i. 13; 2 Pet. ii. 7, etc.), ἐχαρίσθην 1 Cor. ii. 12; Phil. i. 29 (Pluperfect, Her. 8, 5; Aor. Mid. often in N. T., see, in general, Rost, p. 566).

d. The Fut. Pass. of λογίζομαι with a Passive meaning occurs in Rom. ii. 26, likewise ἰαθήσεται Matt. viii. 8, ἀπαρνηθήσομαι Luke xii. 9. Even the Pres. of the first of these is used passively, Rom. iv. 5, cf. Ecclus. xl. 19 (not 2 Cor. x. 2); so also of βιάζεσθαι Matt. xi. 12, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. 184; III. I. 31.

e. The Perf. Pass. εἴργασμαι is sometimes used actively 2 Jno. 8 (Demosth. Conon. 728 a. Xen. M. 2, 6, 6; Lucian. fugit. 2), and sometimes passively Jno. iii. 21 (Xen. M. 3, 10, 9; Plat. rep. 8, 566 a.) Rost, as above. On the other hand, ἧρημαι 1 Tim. v. 8, ἐντέταλμαι Acts xiii. 47 (Herod. 1, 9, 23; Pol. 17, 2, 1; 1 Sam. xvi. 2; Tob. v. 1, etc.), and δέδεγμαι Acts viii. 14, have only an Active meaning. See, in general, Bttm. II. 51; Bhdy. 341, but especially Poppo in the programme mentioned above, and Rost, Gramm. S. 266 ff.

That among verbs usually called Deponent there are many to be
244 regarded as Middle, has been noticed by Rost, Gramm. S. 268 f. and
7th ed. Mehlhorn, as above, S. 39. With regard to πολιτεύεσθαι this is already
275 admitted. But κτάομαι *I acquire for myself*, ἀγωνίζομαι (Rost 268), βιάζεσθαι, μεγαλαυχεῖσθαι, and perhaps δέχομαι, ἀσπάζομαι (according to Passow a Deponent Middle), should be also considered as Middle, as in all of them a reflexive meaning is more or less apparent. Πληροῦσθαι Eph. i. 23 is by Mey. [in 1st and 2d ed.; not so in 3d] called a Deponent, but improperly. Ὑστερεῖσθαι occurs only in the N. T. as synonymous with the Active. Lastly, μαίνομαι as well as ἠττάομαι must, as among the Greeks, be taken Passively; Sommer, as above, p. 36.

§ 39. THE PASSIVE.

1. When a verb governing the Gen. or Dat. of a person, as πιστεύειν τινί, κατηγορεῖν τινος, is construed in the Passive, the Greeks generally make the noun denoting the person the Subject (Krü. 137); as,

a. Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον i.e. πεπιστευμένον ἔχω τὸ εὐαγγ. (Actively πιστεύειν τινί τι), Rom. iii. 2 ἐπιστεύθησαν (the Jews vs. 1) τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ, 1 Cor. ix. 17 οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι cf. Diog. L. 7, 34 πιστευθέντες τὴν ἐν Περγάμῳ βιβλιοθήκην, Pol. 3, 69, 1 πεπιστευμένος τὴν πόλιν παρὰ Ῥωμαίων, 31, 26, 7; Herod. 7, 9, 7; Demosth. Theocr. 507 c.; Appian. civ. 2, 136; Strabo 4, 197; 17, 797, and often. Likewise, in the signification to believe *some one* (πιστεύειν τινί), the Passive πιστεύομαι signifies *I am believed*,[1] e.g. Xen. A. 7, 6, 33; Isocr. Trapez. p. 874; Demosth.
233 Callip. 720 a., βασιλεύομαι Aristot. Nic. 8, 11. It is otherwise in
8th ed. 1 Tim. iii. 16 ἐπιστεύθη (Χριστὸς) ἐν κόσμῳ, which cannot be referred to πιστεύειν Χριστῷ, but presupposes the phrase πιστεύειν Χριστόν, as in 2 Thess. i. 10 ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν is referable to πιστεύειν τι, 1 Jno. iv. 16. Under this head come also the following passages: Acts xxi. 3 ἀναφανέντες τὴν Κύπρον *when it appeared in sight*, i.e. ἀναφανεῖσαν ἔχοντες τὴν K., Heb. xi. 2 ἐν ταύτῃ ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι (μαρτυρεῖν τινι), Acts xvi. 2 etc., Heb. xiii. 16 εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός (Bleek in loc.), likewise viii. 5 καθὼς κεχρημάτισται Μωϋσῆς (Matt. ii. 12, 22; Joseph. antt. 3, 8, 8 and Matt. xi. 5 (Luke vii. 22) πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται, Heb. iv. 2 — the latter passages because the construction εὐαγγελίζεσθαί τινι (see
276 Fr. Mtth. p. 395) and χρηματίζειν τινί (Joseph. antt. 10, 1, 3; 11,

[1] The reverse ἀπιστοῦμαι Wisd. xii. 17.

8, 4) is the usual one; probably also Col. ii. 20 *τί ὡς ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ δογματίζεσθε* (*δογματίζειν τινί* 2 Macc. x. 8) see Mey. In 3 Jno. 12 the Passive *μαρτυρεῖσθαι* is construed also with the Dative of a person.

b. Of verbs governing the Genitive, only the Passive *κατηγοροῦμαι* occurs, Matt. xxvii. 12 *ἐν τῷ κατηγορεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχιερέων*, 245
Acts xxii. 30 *τὸ τί κατηγορεῖται ὑπὸ* (*παρὰ*) *τῶν Ἰουδαίων* (2 Macc. 7th ed.
x. 13). On the other hand, I can find no sufficient reason for taking *κεχάρισμαι* 2 Cor. ii. 10 passively, as Mey. does [yet in the 4th ed. he has it correctly].

In Rom. vi. 17 *ὑπηκούσατε ... εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς*, this construction is perhaps combined with an attraction (for *ὑπηκ. εἰς τύπον ὃν διδαχῆς, ὃν παρεδόθητε*, i.e. *παραδοθέντα ἔχετε*); yet see above, § 24, 2, p. 164.

Heb. vii. 11 *ὁ λαὸς ἐπ' αὐτῆς* (*ἱερωσύνης*) *νενομοθέτηται* may probably be referred to *νομοθετεῖν τινι*: *the people have received the law* (founded) *on the priesthood*, cf. viii. 6. On the other hand, the passages quoted from the Sept. as parallel to *νομοθετεῖν τινά* (*τι*) do not belong here, as in that construction the verb always signifies: guide *some one* in accordance with law, e.g. Ps. cxviii. 33 *νομοθέτησόν με τὴν ὁδὸν τῶν δικαιωμάτων σου*, xxiv. 8 *νομοθετήσει ἁμαρτάνοντας ἐν ὁδῷ*. But the Byzantine writers use *νομοθετεῖν τινα* (in reference to a country or people), Malal. p. 72, 194. The regular construction of the Passive occurs in Deut. xvii. 10 *ὅσα ἂν νομοθετηθῇ σοι.*

2. In the N. T. many verbs which in the Middle signification have uniformly in classical Greek the 1st Aor. Middle, take instead of that the 1st Aor. Passive (cf. § 38, 4), as: *ἀπεκρίθη*[1] (the prevailing form), especially in the Partic. *ἀποκριθείς* (Aor. Middle *ἀπεκρίνατο* Mark xiv. 61; Luke iii. 16; xxiii. 9; Jno. v. 19; xii. 23; Acts iii. 12, and frequently in var. as Jno. i. 26; xii. 34; xviii. 34),[2] cf. Sturz, dial. alex. p. 148 sq.; Lob. Phryn. 148 sq.; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 305. In like manner *διεκρίθη*, Matt. xxi. 21; Mark xi. 23; Rom. iv. 20 (but *ἐκρίθη* in a Passive sense in Acts xxvii. 1). In other passages Aorists still regarded as Aor. Pass. for 234
Middle, viz. *προσεκλίθη* Acts v. 36, *ἐνεδυναμώθη* Rom. iv. 20, *παρε-* 6th ed.
δόθητε vi. 17, *ταπεινώθητε* 1 Pet. v. 6; Jas. iv. 10, are really according to classic (and even N. T.) usage Passive Aorists; just as in Latin *servari*, *delectari*, are used for (taking German as the standard) *servare se*, *delectare se*, cf. Rost 568.[3] The same remark 277

[1] Yet we find the form *ἀπεκρίθη* in the MSS. of Xen. A. 2, 1, 22. On Plato Alc. 2 p. 149 b. see *Phryn.* as above. In authors after the age of Alexander it occurs frequently.

[2] From which we find the Fut. *ἀποκριθήσομαι* Matt. xxv. 37, 45 and in the Sept.

[3] The Aor. Mid. of such verbs is usually employed only with the Acc. in the reflexive construction mentioned § 38, 2. Thus *ἐσώθην* means *me servavi* (servatus sum): but one says *ἐσωσάμην τὸ σῶμα corpus meum* (mihi) *servavi.*

applies to the 2d Aor. καταλλαγήτω 1 Cor. vii. 11; 2 Cor. v. 20 (cf. Rom. v. 10), and to the Fut. (προς)κολληθήσεται Matt. xix. 5 (Eph. v. 31).

Eph. i. 11 ἐκληρώθημεν (see Harl. in loc.) and Acts xvii. 4 προσεκληρώθησαν are obviously to be taken Passively.

246 3. That the Perfect (Mtth. 1097) and the Plup. Passive have
7th ed. also a Middle signification is admitted on all hands since the old-fashioned Perf. and Plup. Middle disappeared from the grammars; Bttm. I. 362. In the N. T. compare Acts xiii. 2 (εἰς) ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς *whereunto I have called them for myself*, xvi. 10 προσκέκληται ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτούς *the Lord has called us for himself* etc. (cf. Exod. iii. 18; v. 3), xxv. 12 καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι *thou hast called for thyself upon Caesar* (appealed to him), Rom. iv. 21 ὃ ἐπήγγελται, δυνατός ἐστι καὶ ποιῆσαι (ὁ θεός), Heb. xii. 26; Jno. ix. 22 συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, 1 Pet. iv. 3 πεπορευμένους ἐν ἀσελγείαις (1 Sam. xiv. 17; 2 Kings v. 25; Job xxx. 28; Zeph. iii. 15; Demosth. Nicostr. 723 c. etc.). (On the Perf. Passive of Deponents, see § 38, 7, p. 259.)

On the other hand, in 1 Pet. iv. 1 πέπαυται ἁμαρτίας (which is usually rendered *peccare desiit*, cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 18) may be also taken as Passive: *he has rest from sin, is preserved from it*, see Kypke in loc. Phil. iii. 12, however, in no event comes under this head. Πολιτεύομαι (Acts xxiii. 1) may according to Poppo's theory be considered as a Deponent (since the Active in an intransitive sense is to be found); yet see above, p. 260. In Rom. xiv. 23 κατακέκριται was undoubtedly employed by the apostle in a Passive sense.

The Perf. Passive is said to be used for the Perf. *Active* in Acts xx. 13 οὕτω γὰρ ἦν (ὁ Παῦλος) διατεταγμένος, and 2 Pet. i. 3 τῆς θείας δυνάμεως ... τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν δεδωρημένης (cf. Jensii lectt. Lucian. p. 247). But in the first passage, διατ. is Middle (as in Polyaen. 6, 1, 5; Joseph. antt. 4, 2, 3 and elsewhere): *so had he appointed;* and in 2 Pet. i. 3 the Perf. comes from the Deponent[1] δωρέομαι. Further, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 179 sqq.

235 Note 1. The Fut. Pass. is used in a very singular manner in Acts xxvi. 16
6th ed. εἰς τοῦτο ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε ὑπηρέτην καὶ μάρτυρα, ὧν τε εἶδες, ὧν
278 τε ὀφθήσομαί σοι. Agreeably to the parallelism the passage might be trans-

[1] *Markland* (explicatt. vett. aliquot locor. in the Leipsic reprint of his edition of Eurip. supplic. p. 324 sq.) refers to this head also the passage, famous in the Predestination controversy, Acts xiii. 48, which he punctuates κ. ἐπίστευσαν, ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγμένοι, εἰς ζωὴν αἰών. and translates: et fidem professi sunt, quotquot (tempus, diem) constituerant, in vitam aeternam. This interpretation, however, should find with unprejudiced expositors as little approval as most of those which come from English philologists, (who at any rate give more attention to the N. T. than the German).

lated: *what thou hast seen, and what I will cause thee to see*, ὀφθήσομαι being taken in a causative sense (see Doederl. Soph. Oedip. C. p. 492; Bornem. in Rosenm. Rep. II. 289). The other interpretation, followed in general by Schott, Kühnöl, Heinrichs, Mey., de Wette: *de quibus* (in reference to which) or *quorum caussa tibi porro apparebo*, would on the whole be more suited to the context, and is certainly simpler than the former. As to ὧν for ἅ by attraction, see § 24, 2, p. 165 sq.

Note 2. As in the Hellenistic language many verbs which in classic Greek are neuter are used transitively (see above, p. 251), expositors affirm that the Passive also, conformably to this causal signification, is occasionally to be taken just like the Hebrew Hophal. But of this there is no certain or even probable instance. In Gal. iv. 9 γνόντες θεόν, μᾶλλον δὲ γνωσθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ even the antithesis requires the passage to be rendered: *knowing God, or rather known* (recognized) *by God*, see my Comment. in loc. 1 Cor. viii. 3 εἴ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ should not be translated, as by Erasm., Beza, Nösselt, Pott, Heydenreich, et al.: *is veram intelligentiam consecutus est;* but the meaning is: *whoever imagines he knows anything* (that is where a γνῶσις φυσιοῦσα exists) *has not yet known as one ought to know, but if any one loves God* (cf. the preceding words ἡ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ), *he* (has not only known as he ought to know, but) *is known by Him* (God), (is himself an object of the highest and truest, that is of divine, knowledge). In 1 Cor. xiii. 12 ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην, the latter undoubtedly refers to the knowledge of God, and Nösselt has correctly rendered the passage: there we shall know all perfectly (not ἐκ μέρους, not as if ἐν αἰνίγματι), even as perfectly as God knows us.[1] It has not yet been shown from Biblical Greek that γινώσκειν denotes *cognoscere facere, edocere;* and probably Pott did not understand himself when he quoted Jno. v. 42; Rom. ii. 18. This meaning, however, meets us in a passage adduced by Stephanus in his Thesaurus from Demosth. cor. (p. 345 c.): ὡμολόγηκε νῦν γ' ὑμᾶς ὑπάρχειν ἐγνωσμένους ἐμὲ μὲν λέγειν ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος, αὐτὸν δ' ὑπὲρ Φιλίππου; but it disappears if we read ἡμᾶς, as Dissen does, on the authority of a Cod., *nos esse cognitos* (i.e. de nobis constare), *me quidem verba facere pro patria*, etc.

247 fifth ed.

Note 3. Frequently it has seemed doubtful whether a particular verbal form is Middle or Passive. The decision is grammatical only in so far as it can be shown that the verb in question was never used either in the Passive or in the Middle, or that in the Middle it had an Active signification. Hence in Rom. i. 24 ἀτιμάζεσθαι is properly regarded as Passive; so too οἰκοδομεῖσθαι 1 Cor. viii. 10, παύεσθαι 1 Pet. iv. 1, ἀνανεοῦσθαι Eph. iv. 23. On the other hand, 1 Cor. i. 2 οἱ ἐπικαλούμενοι τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου can only be Middle. In other passages either the context must decide, — as in

236 fifth ed. 279

[1] A similar antithesis of the Active and Passive occurs in Phil. iii. 12 f. Cf. Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 8 δύναταί τις ὠφελῆσαι καὶ ἄλλους μὴ αὐτὸς ὠφελημένος; Liban. ep. 2.

2 Cor. ii. 10 where κεχάρισμαι (Mey. to the contrary [in his earlier edd.]) is to be regarded as Middle, and Rom. iii. 9 where προέχεσθαι clearly cannot be Passive; or the known usage of the writer elsewhere, as in Eph. vi. 10 in respect to ἐνδυναμοῦσθε.

248 7th ed.

§ 40. THE TENSES.

1. With regard to the Tenses of the verb, N. T. grammarians and expositors [1] have been guilty of the greatest mistakes.[2] In general, the tenses [3] are employed in the N. T. exactly in the same manner as in Greek authors, [4] viz. the Aorist marks simply the past (merely occurrence at some former time — viewed too as momentary), and is the tense usually employed in narration; the Imperfect and Pluperfect always have reference to secondary events connected in respect to time with the principal event (as relative tenses); the Perfect brings the past into connection with the present, representing an action in reference to the present as concluded. No one of these tenses strictly and properly taken can stand for another, as com-
237 mentators often would have us believe.[5] But where such an inter-
6th ed. change appears to take place (cf. Georgi, Vind. p. 252 sqq. Hiero-
280 crit. I. 58 sq.) either it is merely apparent, and a sufficient reason (especially a rhetorical one) can be discovered why this and no other tense has been used, or it is to be set down to the account of a certain inaccuracy peculiar to the language of the people, which did not conceive and express relations of time with entire precision

[1] Cf. *Bertholdt*, Einleit. VI. 3151: "In the use of the tenses, it is well known that the N. T. writers pay very little regard to the rules of grammar."

[2] Occasioned in part by parallel passages which it was thought must be considered as exactly alike grammatically. The abuse of parallelism in exposition ought sometime to be exhibited separately.

[3] The three principal tenses with the Greeks were the Present, the Perfect, and the Future: *Plut.* Isid. c. 9 ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὂν καὶ ἐσόμενον, cf. Odyss. 16, 437.

[4] Cf., besides the well known grammatical works (especially *Hm.* emend. rat. p. 180 sqq.; *Schneider*, Vorles. über griech. Gramm. I. 239 ff.; *Krü.* 147 ff.), *L. G. Dissen*, de temporibus et modis verbi graeci Gött. 1808. 4to.; *H. Schmidt*, doctrinae tempor. verbi gr. et lat. expositio histor. Hal. 1836–1842. 4 Abthl. 4to. An earlier dissertation by *G. W. Oeder*, Chronol. grammat. Gött. 1743 (in *Pott*, Sylloge VII. 133 sqq.) is of little use. On the other hand, the enall. temp. was combated in *A. zum Felde*, de enall. praes. temp. in S. S. usu. Kil. 1711. 4to., and in *Woken's* work, mentioned above (p. 8, Note [1]); cf. also the views of A. Slides in *Georgi*, Vind. 252.

[5] The arbitrary interchange of tenses (enallage temporum) is accounted a Hebraism, as it is imagined that in Hebrew the Preterite is indiscriminately used for the Future, and vice versa. But the incorrectness of this opinion has been already shown by *Gesenius* (Lehrgeb. S. 760 sqq.), and still more thoroughly by *Ewald* (Krit. Gr. 523 ff.).

(Krü. 158 f.). The latter occurs chiefly in the interchange (or combination) of those tenses which, like the Preterites, denote one and the same principal relation of time.

2. Accordingly the PRESENT tense, which expresses present time 249
in all its relations (particularly in rules, maxims, and principles of 7th ed.
permanent validity, cf. Jno. vii. 52), is used

a. Only in appearance for the Future (exactly as in Latin, German, etc.) when an action still future is to be designated as as good as already present, either because it is already firmly resolved upon or because it follows according to some unalterable law ; as, Matt. xxvi. 2 *οἴδατε, ὅτι μετὰ δύο ἡμέρας τὸ πάσχα γίνεται* (*is* the Passover) *καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι* (*is delivered*, an event which as a divine decree is fixed), Jno. xiv. 3 *ἐὰν πορευθῶ . . . πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι* (xxi. 23), Matt. xvii. 11 *Ἠλίας μὲν ἔρχεται* (a point of Jewish Christology) *καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα* cf. Jno. vii. 42, Luke xii. 54 *ὅταν ἴδητε τὴν νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἀπὸ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε· ὄμβρος ἔρχεται* (in reference to a meteorological principle founded on experience), Col. iii. 6 *δι' ἃ ἔρχεται ἡ ὀργὴ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας* (according to a law of God's moral government), Heb. iv. 3 ; 1 Cor. iii. 13 ; xv. 2 ; Eph. v. 5. Hence the expression *ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε*, used by Jesus Jno. iv. 21 ; xvi. 2, and the Jewish designation *ὁ ἐρχόμενος* (הַבָּא) for the Messiah. The phrase in John *ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ* followed by the Fut., Jno. xii. 26 ; xiv. 3 ; xvii. 24, may be also brought under this head, if we do not prefer the interpretation *where I am*, where I have my home. It would be a mistake in translating these passages to substitute the Future for the Present preferred by the writer. Cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 153 ; Krü. 149, and as to Latin, Ramshorn p. 401. In other passages the Present is employed to denote what is just about to take place, what one is on the point of doing, that for which he is already making preparation (Hm. Vig. 746 and Soph. 281
Oed. C. 91 ; Bekker, specim. Philostr. p. 73 sq. ; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 202) ; as, Jno. x. 32 *διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον λιθάζετέ με* (they had already taken up stones), Jno. xiii. 6 *κύριε, σύ μου νίπτεις τοὺς πόδας ;* (he had already prepared to wash them), xiii. 27 ; [1] xvi. 17 238
(*ὑπάγω*), xvii. 11 ; xxi. 3 ; 1 Cor. xii. 31 ; 2 Cor. xiii. 1 ; Rom. 6th ed.
xv. 25. See, in general, Held, Plutarch. Tim. p. 335 sq.

[1] *Ὃ ποιεῖς, ποίησον τάχιον* quod (jam) facis, quo jam occupatus es, id (fac) perfice ocius ; cf. Arrian. Epict. 4, 9, 18 *ποίει ἃ ποιεῖς*, 3, 23, 1, and Senec. benef. 2, 5 fac, si quid facis ; see *Wetsten.* I. 931. The command or recommendation here is not conveyed in the verb, but in the adverb annexed.

Many other passages have been referred to this head with still less plausibility. In Jno. iii. 36 the thought is weakened, if ἔχει be taken for ἕξει. The notion which John attached to ζωή not only admits, but almost requires, the Present. And apart from this, the expression ἔχειν ζωὴν αἰώνιον might very well be used of one who indeed is not yet in the enjoyment of eternal life, but who in the certainty of his hope already as it
250 were *possesses* it.[1] So also Jno. v. 26; Matt. v. 46 have been correctly
7th ed. explained by Fr. On the other hand, we must not with him regard Matt. iii. 10 as a general maxim: *every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down* (is wont to be hewn down). These words are connected by οὖν with ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται, and require to be rendered with a special reference to the preceding δένδρα: *the axe is already lying at the root of the trees; accordingly every tree* etc. *is*, (will be) to a certainty, *hewn down;* i.e. from the fact of the axe's being already applied, it may be inferred what fate awaits the bad trees. 1 Cor. xv. 35 πῶς ἐγείρονται οἱ νεκροί treats of the resurrection of the dead, not as a fact (of the future), but as a doctrine: *in what manner does the resurrection of the dead* (according to thy teaching) *take place?* cf. vs. 42. In the same way we can say: Christ *is* the Judge; the punishments of the damned *are* eternal etc. In like manner Matt. ii. 4 ποῦ ὁ Χριστὸς γεννᾶται (i.e. where is the birthplace of the Messiah?) and Jno. vii. 52. In 2 Cor. v. 1 οἴδαμεν, ὅτι, ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους καταλυθῇ, οἰκοδομὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ἔχομεν, the Future ἕξομεν would have been inexact; the instantaneous entrance into a new habitation, the moment the καταλύεσθαι takes place, is intended to be expressed. In Matt. vii. 8 the Present (of what usually occurs, Krü. 148) is connected, in a statement of universal application, with the Future, cf. Rom. vi. 16; Gal. ii. 16. On the other hand, in Matt. iii. 11 the Present and the Future (of one about to come) are intentionally distinguished: the Present refers to the predicted, permanent (and already
282 present) personality; the Future, βαπτίσει, to a particular function which he is to execute. Lastly, in the parallel passages Matt. xxiv. 40 and Luke xvii. 34 we find in the former the Present, ὁ εἷς παραλαμβάνεται, but in the latter the Future, εἷς παραληφθήσεται; in the one passage the fact introduced by the Fut. (ἔσονται) is by a vivid conception regarded as present (see what follows); in the other, it is depicted in all its parts as future. Cf. besides, Jno. xvi. 14, 15; Heb. i. 11.

b. For the Aorist as a historical tense, only when the narrator wishes to represent the past vividly, as though it were just taking place (Longin. c. 25; Mtth. 1135 f.; cf. Zumpt, lat. Gramm. S. 431.); Jno. i. 29 τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει ... καὶ λέγει (vs. 32 καὶ ἐμαρτύρησεν), i. 44 εὑρίσκει Φίλιππον καὶ λέγει (ἠθέλησεν just before)

[1] In what immediately follows, οὐκ ὄψεται ζωήν, the Apostle very accurately distinguishes the Future from the Present.

cf. 46, xiii. 4 f.; Matt. xxvi. 40 *ἔρχεται πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς καὶ εὑρίσκει* 239
αὐτοὺς καθεύδοντας. Such a Present is often introduced abruptly 6th ed.
between Aorists, Jno. ix. 13; xviii. 28; xix. 9; Acts x. 11; Mark v. 15; or Present and Aorist are combined in the same verse, as Mark vi. 1; ix. 2; xi. 15; Jno. xx. 6, 19. In the first three Gospels one Evangelist uses the Present, while in the corresponding narrative another employs the Aorist; with Matt. xxi. 13 cf. Mark xi. 17 f., and with Matt. xxii. 23 cf. Mark xii. 18. This Present occurs also in the Apocalyptic visions; as, Rev. xi. 9; xii. 2. As 251
to the Sept., in which this usage is extremely rare, see Thiersch 7th ed.
p. 187. Suddenness in a series of past events is indicated with striking effect by the Present in Matt. ii. 13 *ἀναχωρησάντων αὐτῶν ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου φαίνεται κατ᾽ ὄναρ*, etc.

Similar instances occur in Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 15; Cyr. 4, 6, 4; 10; 5, 4, 3; Ages. 2, 19–20; Thuc. 1, 48; 2, 68; Paus. 1, 17, 4; 9, 6, 1; Arrian. Al. 7, 17, 5; Dion. H. IV. 2113; Achill. Tat. 4, 4, p. 85; Jacobs, Xen. Ephes. 5, 12, p. 113; cf. Abresch, Aristaen. p. 11 sq.; Ast, Plat. Phaedr. p. 335; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 68.

c. Sometimes the Present includes also a past tense (Mdv. 108), viz. when the verb expresses a state which commenced at an earlier period but still continues, — a state in its duration; as, Jno. xv. 27 *ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐστέ*, viii. 58 *πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμι* (cf. Jer. i. 5 *πρὸ τοῦ με πλάσαι σε ἐν κοιλίᾳ, ἐπίσταμαί σε*, Ps. lxxxix. 2), 2 Pet. iii. 4; 1 Jno. iii. 8. To this head may be referred likewise Acts xxv. 11 *εἰ μὲν ἀδικῶ καὶ ἄξιον θανάτου πέπραχά τι* (cf. Xen. C. 5, 2, 24); *ἀδικῶ*, however, denotes a quality existing in reference to 283
the judge, *ἄδικός εἰμι*, see Bhdy. 370; Mtth. 1137. In Jno. viii. 14 there is first an Aorist and then a Present: *οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον ... ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ οἴδατε, πόθεν ἔρχομαι*.

In 1 Jno. iii. 5 the sinlessness of Jesus is considered as still present to faith (see Lücke); but in Acts xxvi. 31 *οὐδὲν θανάτου ἄξιον ἢ δεσμῶν πράσσει* does not refer to Paul's past life, but to his conduct in general: *this man* (so simple an enthusiast) *does nothing bad*; see Bengel in loc. (Kühnöl is wrong); cf. Jno. vii. 51. Recent expositors have admitted that in Heb. ii. 16 *ἐπιλαμβ.* is not to be taken as a past tense (Georgi, Vind. 25; Palair. 479); likewise *εἰσίασιν* in ix. 6 is a pure Pres. In 1 Cor. xi. 30 *κοιμῶνται* is properly translated by Bengel *obdormiunt* (later critics have all either rendered it as a past tense, or taken no notice of it; yet even in Byzantine writers *κοιμᾶσθαι* signifies only *to fall asleep, expire*, and not *to be dead*). On *παράγεται* in 1 Jno. ii. 8 see Lücke. In Jno. v. 2 no expositor of any judgment will admit the possibility even that *ἐστί* stands for *ἦν*. On the other hand, the use of the Present does not necessarily

prove that the locality was still in the same condition when the author wrote; cf. Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 135 sqq.

The Present in *dependent* clauses may appear to stand for the Imperfect; as, Jno. ii. 9 *οὐκ ᾔδει, πόθεν ἐστίν*, iv. 1 *ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ... ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει*, Mark v. 14 *ἐξῆλθον ἰδεῖν, τί ἐστι τὸ γεγονός*, xii. 41; xv. 47; 240 6th ed. Jno. i. 40; v. 13, 15; vi. 5, 24, 64; Luke vii. 37; xix. 3; Acts iv. 13; ix. 26; x. 18; xii. 3; Heb. xi. 8, 13 — (the Preterite, found in most of these passages according to a greater or smaller number of Codd., is a manifest correction.) But the use of the Present in such cases is a pure Greek construction (see Vig. p. 214 sq.; cf. below § 41 b. 5), founded 252 7th ed. properly in a mingling of the oratio recta and oratio obliqua (Porson, Eurip. Orest. p. 36 Lips.),[1] cf. Pol. 5, 26, 6; 8, 22, 2 and 4; Ael. 2, 13 ext.; Long. past. 1, 10 and 13. In these passages the Imperf. or the Aor. might have intimated that what was inquired about or heard was already past at the time when the inquiry or the hearing took place; cf. Jno. ix. 8 *οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον, ὅτι τυφλὸς ἦν*, Luke viii. 53; Matt. xxvii. 18; Acts iv. 13.

3. The Imperfect, as in Greek prose authors (Bhdy. 372 f.; Krü. 149 ff.), is used

a. When a past action is to be designated in relation to another simultaneous action as then going on (Bremi, Demosth. p. 19); as, Jno. iv. 31 *ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ἠρώτων αὐτόν* (viii. 6, 8), vi. 21; Luke 284 xiv. 7 *ἔλεγε ... ἐπέχων, πῶς τὰς πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο how they* (then) *were choosing out*, xxiv. 32 *ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ*, Acts viii. 36 *ὡς ἐπορεύοντο κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν, ἦλθον ἐπί τι ὕδωρ*, x. 17; xvi. 4; xxii. 11; Luke vi. 19; Jno. v. 16; xii. 6.

b. To denote a continuous or statedly repeated past action (Mtth. 1117, 1133; Schoem. ad Plut. Agid. p. 137; Held, Plutarch. Aem. P. p. 267); as, Jno. iii. 22 *ἐκεῖ διέτριβε μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἐβάπτιζεν*, Rom. xv. 22 *ἐνεκοπτόμην τὰ πολλὰ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν*, 1 Cor. x. 4 *ἔπινον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματ. ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας* (where *ἔπιον* denotes simply the past and completed action; but *ἔπινον* the continuation of it during the journey through the wilderness), xiii. 11 *ὅτε ἤμην νήπιος, ὡς νήπιος ἐλάλουν*, Acts xiii. 11 *περιάγων ἐζήτει χειραγωγούς*, Matt. xiii. 34 *χωρὶς παραβολῆς οὐκ ἐλάλει* (during his ministry), cf. Luke v. 15; vi. 23; viii. 41, 52; xvii. 28; xxiv. 14, 27; Matt. iii. 5; xxvii. 39; Mark i. 7, 31; Jno. v. 18; vii. 1; xi. 5; xiii. 22 f.; xii. 2; xxi. 18; Acts vi. 1, 7 (Thuc. 1, 29); ix. 20; xi. 20; xviii. 25; xxvi. 1, 11; xxviii. 6; Rev. i. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 5; 2 Pet. ii. 8; Heb. xii. 10;

[1] On the still more extended use of the Present in parenthetical clauses for a Preterite, see *Bttm.* Gr. § 124, Note 6, and ad Philoct. p. 129.

Col. iii. 7, etc. So Xen. A. 1, 2, 18; 4, 5, 18; 5, 4, 24; 6, 3, 3; Mem. 1, 1, 5; Apol. Socr. 14. Accordingly the Imperfect denotes a custom or habit; as, Mark xv. 6 *κατὰ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα δέσμιον*, xiv. 12 (Demosth. Phil. 2. 27 b.); cf. Hm. Vig. 746.

c. To express an action commenced in time past but not completed [1] (Schaef. Demosth. I. 337 and Plutarch. IV. 398; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 646; Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. p. 282; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 220; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 178); as, Luke i. 59 *ἐκάλουν αὐτὸ . . . Ζαχαρίαν* (the mother objects, and he is called John), Matt. 241
iii. 14 *ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης διεκώλυεν αὐτόν* cf. vs. 15, Acts vii. 26 *συνήλ-* 6th ed.
λασσεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην (Moses) cf. vs. 27 (according to good 253
Codd. [Sin. too], see Fritzsche de crit. conformat. p. 31). Similar 7th ed.
instances occur in Eurip. Iph. T. 360; Herc. f. 437; Her. 1, 68; Thuc. 2, 5; Demosth. Mid. 396 b.; Xenoph. A. 4, 5, 19; Mem. 1, 2, 29; Paus. 4, 9, 4; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 337, note. On the other hand, Heb. xi. 17. (*προσέφερεν*) does not come under this head; but Gal. i. 13 probably would, if *πορθεῖν* be rendered *destroy;* yet see my Com. in loc.

d. Sometimes also in narration apparently for the Aorist, when events are described at which the narrator was present; as, Luke x. 18 *ἐθεώρουν τὸν σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα.* The narrative thus becomes more graphic and animated than it 285
would be with the Aorist, which simply reports and confines within a single point of time; cf. also Acts xvi. 22 *ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίζειν* (cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 620) *they gave orders* (while I was present) etc. (Mtth. 1117). Accordingly this may be referred to No. 1. Cf. Hm. Soph. Oed. C. p. 76; Soph. Aj. p. 139; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 155; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 225; Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 84, 142; Mtth. 1138; Bhdy. 373. In no case is it necessary to take this tense for the Pluperfect; (yet see Poppo, as above; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 5; Krüger, Dion. H. p. 304). In Acts iv. 13 *ἐθαύμαζον ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτούς, ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν* must be closely taken together: *they marvelled and recognized* (roused by their very wonder to more attentive observation) *that*, etc. Kühnöl is wrong, following Raphel, annot. II. 37.

In many passages Codd. vary between the Imperfect and the Aorist, e.g. Mark vi. 12; xiv. 70 (see Fr. in loc.), Acts vii. 31; viii. 17, as in Greek authors also the forms of these two tenses are often interchanged (cf.

[1] *Hm.* Soph. Aj. 1106: in eo, quod quis voluit facere, nec tamen perfecit, quod aptius adhiberi tempus potest, quam quod ab ea ipsa ratione nomen habet, imperfectum? Cf. *Mdv.* 112.

Boisson. Eunap. p. 431 and Philostr. her. p. 530), and sometimes differ very little in meaning (Schaef. Plutarch. IV. 346; Siebelis, Pausan. IV. 290). It often depends on the writer whether he will regard the action as momentary or as continued, — as a point or a period in time, Kühner II. 74 (Matt. xxvi. 59 ἐζήτουν ψευδομαρτυρίαν ... καὶ οὐχ εὗρον, but Mark xiv. 55 καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκον, cf. Matt. xix. 13 with Mark x. 13); and thus, particularly in (later) Greek writers, the Imperfect of verbs of *saying*, *going*, *sending* is not unfrequently used where the Aorist appeared to be requisite, Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 570 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Tim. p. 484 sq.; cf. Mark ii. 27; iv. 10; v. 18; vii. 17; x. 17; Luke iii. 7; vii. 36; viii. 9, 41; x. 2; Acts iii. 3; ix. 21.

The Imperfect and the Aorist are connected with appropriate distinction in Luke viii. 23 κατέβη λαῖλαψ ... καὶ συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνευον, xv. 28; Mark vii. 35; xi. 18; Jas. ii. 22; Matt. xxi. 8 f.; Jno. vii. 14; xii. 13, 17; xx. 3; Acts xi. 6 f.; xxi. 3 (Jno. i. 5); Philem. 13, 14; 1 Cor. xi. 23 (in the same way the Imperfect and Perfect in 1 Cor. xiii. 11) cf. Thuc. 7, 20,
254 44; Xen. A. 3, 4, 31; 5, 4, 24; Plutarch. Agis 19; Arrian. Al. 2, 20, 3;[1]
7th ed. Reisig, Soph. Oed. C. p. 254 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 29; Ellendt, Arrian.
242 Al. II. 67 sq.
6th ed.

The Imperfect might appear to be put for the Present (yet see Mehl-
286 horn, Anacr. p. 235 sq.; cf. Fuhr, Dicaearch. p. 156 sq.) in Col. iii. 18 ὑποτάσσεσθε τοῖς ἀνδράσιν, ὡς ἀνῆκεν, ἐν κυρίῳ, ut par *est*, and in Eph. v. 4 (μὴ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν) αἰσχρότης ἢ μωρολογία ἢ εὐτραπελία, ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν (immediately before, καθὼς πρέπει) var. But it must be rendered: ut oportebat, ut par erat, *as was fit*, *ought to be* (already hitherto), see Mtth. 1138; Bornem. Schol. p. 181; for every such exhortation, strictly speaking, involves the assumption that what is enjoined has not hitherto been observed[2] (Krü. 150). Cf. § 41 **a.** 2. On Eph. as above, see ibid. In Matt. xxvii. 54 ἦν refers to one now dead: *he was God's Son.*

4. The PERFECT is employed in strict accordance with its proper import, whenever the past is to be put into relation with the present; that is, when something past is intended to be represented as something just now (in the present) completed: (*I have com-*

[1] The following passage is particularly instructive: Diod. S. Exc. Vat. p. 25, 9 sqq. ὁ Κροῖσος μετεπέμπετο ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τοὺς ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ πρωτεύοντας ... μετεπέμψατο δὲ καὶ Σόλωνα, etc. Cf. also Plat. Parmen. 126 c. ταῦτα εἰπόντες ἐβαδίζομεν καὶ κατελάβομεν τὸν Ἀντιφῶντα etc., and from the LXX. Num. xxxiii. 38 f. ἀνέβη Ἀαρὼν καὶ ἀπέθανεν ... Ἀαρὼν ἦν τριῶν καὶ εἴκοσι καὶ ἑκατὸν ἐτῶν, ὅτε ἀπέθνησκεν.

[2] To take ἀνῆκεν, as *Huther* does, for a Perfect with the meaning of the Present, is as unnecessary as it is grammatically inadmissible. Should καθῆκεν, προσῆκεν also be regarded as Perfects? Must then the Perfect ἧκα, elsewhere rare, have established itself just in these forms even in Attic? Besides, no passage can be adduced in which these words necessarily have the meaning of a Present, — provided only a reader acquires the power of keeping the German mode of thought subordinate to the Greek.

manded, my command is at present one previously given).[1] Here the result of the action is usually, but not necessarily (Krü. 151), conceived of as permanent. The following instances are especially instructive: Luke xiii. 2 δοκεῖτε, ὅτι οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι οὗτοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας ... ἐγένοντο, ὅτι τοιαῦτα πεπόνθασιν *that these Galileans were sinners because they have suffered*, i.e. suffered not merely once or in time past (that would be the Aor.), but that they stand recorded among the historical examples of those who have been cut off by (a violent) death; iv. 6 ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται (ἡ ἐξουσία) i.e. I am in possession of it, after having received it, commissam habeo potestatem (the Aorist would denote *it was delivered to me*, which would leave it uncertain whether the possession of it still continued); v. 32 οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους *I am not here* (on earth) *in order to*, etc. (in Matt. ix. 13 in narrative style: οὐκ ἦλθον *I came not*, was not sent), cf. vii. 20, 50; Rom. vii. 2 ἡ ὕπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ δέδεται νόμῳ *is bound* (accordingly belongs to), Gal. ii. 7 πεπίστευμαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *concreditum mihi habeo*, etc. (his apostolic functions continue, he is still in the exercise of them), likewise 1 Thess. ii. 4 καθὼς δεδοκιμάσμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πιστευθῆναι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, 1 Cor. xi. 15 ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαίου δέδοται (γυναικί) *she has* (by a fixed arrangement of nature) *hair for*, etc., Heb. x. 14 μιᾷ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους (where the contrast μιᾷ ... τετελείωκεν must not be overlooked), Jno. xix. 22 ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα, Mark x. 40; xi. 21; xvi. 4; Luke xiii. 12; Jno. vii. 19, 22; viii. 33; xiii. 12;[2] xv. 24; xix. 30; xx. 21; Acts viii. 14; Rom. iii. 21; v. 2; ix. 6; 1 Cor. ii. 11; iv. 4; vii. 14 f.; 2 Cor. iii. 10; vi. 11; Col. ii. 14; iii. 3; Heb. i. 4; iii. 3; vii. 6, 14; viii. 6, 13; ix. 18, 26; xii. 2; 1 Jno. v. 9 f.; 3 Jno. 12; 1 Pet. iv. 1; Rev. iii. 17. Hence in quotations from the O. T. prophecies the very frequent use of γέγραπται, or κεχρημάτισται Heb. viii. 5, or εἴρηκε Heb. i. 13; iv. 4, etc.[3]

255 7.b ed. 243 6.a ed. 287

[1] *Hm.* emend. rat. p. 186: γέγραφα tempus significat praeteritum terminatum praesenti tempore ita, ut res, quae perfecto exprimitur, nunc peracta dicatur, illudque jam, peractam rem esse, praesens sit. *Poppo* in his Progr. Emendanda et supplenda ad Matthiaei gram. gr. (Frkf. on the Oder, 1832) p. 6, thus defines the nature of the Perfect: actionem plane praeteritam, quae aut nunc ipsum seu modo finita est aut per effectus suos durat, notat.

[2] Γινώσκετε, τί πεποίηκα ὑμῖν; where the finished action (ἔνιψα) is represented, according to its symbolical import, as continuing its influence down to the present. Cf. xv. 18.

[3] Likewise in 2 Cor. xii. 9 εἴρηκέ μοι· ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου the Perfect refers to a statement (of the Lord's) which was to be expressed as not merely having been made,

We find the Perfect and Aorist joined together (cf. Weber, Demosth. 480) in Luke iv. 18 ἔχρισέ με εὐαγγελίσασθαι, ἀπέσταλκέ με κηρῦξαι *he anointed me . . .* and *hath sent me* (the former viewed as what took place once; the latter, as still present in its effects), Mark xv. 44 Πιλᾶτος ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκε· καὶ . . . ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανε (the latter referring to the event, the act of dying; the former, to the effect, the *being dead*), Heb. ii. 14 ἐπεὶ τὰ παιδία κεκοινώνηκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, καὶ αὐτὸς μετέσχε (at his incarnation) τῶν αὐτῶν, 1 Cor. xv. 4 ὅτι ἐτάφη (an event that once took place, long past) καὶ ὅτι ἐγήγερται τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (continues in its effects in the new life of Jesus), 2 Cor. i. 19; ix. 2; Acts xxi. 28; Jno. viii. 40; iv. 38; xiii. 3; 1 Jno. i. 1.[1] Characteristic are the following passages also: Col. i. 16 ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (the act of creation) . . . τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται (doctrinal view of the completed and now existing creation), Jno. xvii. 14; xx. 23 (Mey); 1 Cor. xv. 27; Col. iii. 3.

The Perfect simply for the Aorist in narration occurs in Rev. v. 7 ἦλθε καὶ εἴληφε (τὸ βιβλίον) without var., viii. 5. The Perfect is thus used purely with the signification of an Aorist particularly in later writers (especially the Scholiasts, Poppo, Thuc.
256 III. II. 763), Schaef. Demosth. I. 468; Wyttenbach, Plut. Mor. I.
7th ed. 321 sq. (Lips.); Lehrs, quaestion. epic. p. 274; Index to Petr.
244 Patric. in the Bonn edition, p. 647; Bhdy. 379. Less remarkable
6th ed. is 2 Cor. xi. 25 . . . ἔλαβον, ἐρραβδίσθην . . . ἐλιθάσθην . . . ἐναυάγησα,
288 νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα, Heb. xi. 28 πίστει πεποίηκε τὸ πάσχα καὶ τὴν πρόσχυσιν τοῦ αἵματος (nothing but Aorists precede and follow) cf. also verse 17. In such enumerations of detached facts, it was a matter of indifference whether the Aorist or the Perfect should be employed, they are both alike suitable (I was stoned, I suffered shipwreck, I have spent a day, etc.). In Mark iii. 26 nobody will take μεμέρισται after ἀνέβη for an Aorist because in vs. 25 the Aor. μερισθῇ occurs.

The Perfect is used for the Present,

a. Only in so far as the Perfect denotes an action or state whose commencement and occasion were completed in time past (Hm. Vig. 748); as, Jno. xx. 29 ὅτι ἑώρακάς με, πεπίστευκας, where the *origin* of his (still existing faith) is intended to be indicated, iii. 18;

but as still in force (*he has given me an answer*, and I must rest satisfied with it). I do not see what *Rückert* could here find strange. *Meyer* is now right.

[1] Cf. Lucian. dial. d. 19, 1 ἀφώπλισας αὐτὸν καὶ νενίκηκας.

xi. 27; v. 45 *Μωϋσῆς, εἰς ὃν ἠλπίκατε*, in whom you have (placed your hope) hoped, and still hope (in quo repositam habetis spem vestram). Similar instances are, 2 Cor. i. 10 *εἰς ὃν ἠλπίκαμεν*, 1 Tim. vi. 17; Jude 6. As to *ἑώρακα* Jno. ix. 37, etc., see note further on. 2 Tim. iv. 8 *ἠγαπηκότες τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ who have loved*, and therefore now love. The Pluperf. of such verbs has naturally the signification of the Imperfect, Luke xvi. 20. To this head we must by no means refer Jno. i. 34 *κἀγὼ ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα*, where the latter Perfect appears to denote that the testimony concerning Christ given by John at the baptism stands complete, continues firm and valid: *I have seen and have testified.* Essentially the same explanation applies to the Perfects in Heb. vii. 6 (9), where it is manifest that more than a mere fact is intended to be related.

b. After clauses which convey a supposition (*εἰ*, *ἐάν* with a Fut. or Aor., seldom with a Particip.) to express an action *still future*, but viewed in this event as (occurring forthwith and so) wholly completed;[1] as, Eurip. El. 686 *εἰ παλαισθεὶς πτῶμα θανάσιμον πεσεῖ, τέθνηκα ἐγώ*, Soph. Philoct. 75 and Liv. 21, 43 si eundem animum habueritis, *vicimus*, cf. Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 156; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 470; Hm. Aristoph. nub. p. 175 sq.; Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 512 and Gr. 1125 f.; Krü. 152. In the N. T. see Rom. xiv. 23 *ὁ διακρινόμενος, ἐὰν φάγῃ, κατακέκριται is condemned*, the sentence of condemnation has been (at the same moment) and remains pronounced against him, he lies under condemnation, iv. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 19, 20, and with a Participle Jno. iii. 18 *ὁ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται*, Rom. xiii. 8. On the other hand, the Perfect is not used for the Fut. in Jno. v. 24 *μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν*; the passage has no reference at all to a future event, but to something that has already occurred (*ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον*), cf. 1 Jno. iii. 14; Lücke, Comment. II. 52. Further, in Jno. xvii. 10 Christ uses the word *δεδόξασμαι* proleptically in reference to the disciples, who already believe, cf. xvii. 11; but in xiv. 7 *καὶ ἀπ' ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν καὶ ἑωράκατε αὐτόν* must be rendered: *from henceforth ye know him and have seen him*, not with Kühnöl: eum mox accuratius cognoscetis et quasi oculis videbitis, cf. Demosth. Lacrit. 597 a. *ἀνθρώπῳ, ὃν ἡμεῖς οὔτε γινώσκομεν οὔθ' ἑωράκαμεν πώποτε*. See, further, Lücke in loc.

257 7th ed. 289

245 6th ed.

[1] The N. T. does not contain a clear instance of the Hebrew prophetic Perfect (*Gesen.* Lg. 764), which in the Sept. is usually rendered by a Future. Akin to it is the usage of the Greek augurs, who begin with the Fut. but continue in the Aorist, Iliad. 4, 158 sqq.; Pind. Pyth. 4, 56; Isthm. 5, 51, see *Böckh* not. crit. p. 462.

In Jas. v. 2 ὁ πλοῦτος ὑμῶν σέσηπε, καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν σητόβρωτα γέγονεν the Perf. is not put for the Pres. or Fut.; but the case indicated by the Apostle in ταλαιπωρ. ὑμῶν τ. ἐπερχομ. is viewed as already present, and consequently the σήπειν of the riches as already completed. In Jno. xvii. 22 δέδωκα does not signify *tribuam;* Christ contemplates his life as terminated, his disciples have already assumed his place. In Luke x. 19 δέδωκα and δίδωμι would be equally appropriate; Tdf. justly prefers the former.

That the Perf. is used also for the Pluperf. (which is not impossible), Haab p. 95 erroneously attempts to prove by Jno. xii. 7 εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ τετήρηκεν αὐτό; for here τετήρηκεν is to be regarded as strictly a Perfect (*she has kept it*, and accordingly uses it now), since Jesus means figuratively to represent *this* anointing as that which prepares him for the grave. The reading, however, is doubtful.

That the Perfects (and Aorists) of many verbs have inherently, and according to established usage, the signification of the Present, is well known; and is explained by the (inchoative) primary meaning of these verbs (Fr. Rom. I. 254; Bengel on Rom. iii. 23); as, κέκτημαι *I possess*,[1]
290 from κτάομαι *I acquire;* κεκοίμημαι (I have fallen asleep) *I am asleep*, from κοιμάομαι *fall asleep;* οἶδα *I know*, from εἴδω *I see;* ἕστηκα *I stand*, from ἵστημι *place*, properly, I have placed myself (hence also 2 Thess. ii. 2 ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ Χρ. cf. Palair. in loc., Rom. ix. 19 τίς ἀνθέστηκε *who resists him?* cf. xiii. 2; 2 Tim. iv. 6 ἐφέστηκε); likewise ἔοικα Jas. i. 6, 23. The Plup. of such verbs then naturally becomes equivalent to an Imperfect,
258 as εἱστήκεισαν Matt. xii. 46, ᾔδειν Jno. ii. 9; xx. 9, etc. Also κέκραγα from
7th ed. κράζειν has the meaning of a Present (Jno. i. 15), see Bttm. II. 57; Bhdy. 279, and ἑώρακα sometimes signifies: *I* (have got a sight, and) *see* Jno. ix. 37; 1 Jno. iv. 20. But in Phil. iii. 7 ἥγημαι (Mtth. 1139) is to be taken as properly a Preterite antithetical to ἡγοῦμαι verse 8.

246 On the other hand the Present ἥκω means, *I have come, I am here* (Mtth.
6th ed. 1136) Jno. ii. 4; iv. 47; 1 Jno. v. 20, and so ἀκούω may be sometimes rendered by *audisse* 1 Cor. xi. 18 (Xen. A. 5, 5, 8; Mem. 3, 5, 9; Plat. Gorg. 503 c.; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 8; see Lucian. fug. 7; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 9 sq.; Franke, Demosth. p. 62). This, however, is the case only when the hearing (in effect) continues; as we too say: *I hear* thou art sick, cf. 2 Thess. iii. 11 and Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 246.[2] To denote the act of hear-

[1] In the N. T. this verb, in other tenses besides the Perfect, is occasionally translated incorrectly by *possess*. Luke xviii. 12 should be rendered, of all *I acquire*, quae mihi redeunt; and xxi. 19 by perseverance *acquire*, or you *will acquire*, your souls; they will then for the first time become your true property, not to be taken away. *Schott* now explains the passage rightly. As to 1 Thess. iv. 4, see *de Wette*. Yet κτᾶσθαι appears to signify *possideo* in Aesop. 142, 2. As to κοιμῶνται 1 Cor. xi. 30, which also is usually considered as equivalent to κεκοίμηνται, see above, 2 c, p. 267.

[2] Just so πυνθάνομαι *I understand*, Demosth. Calipp. p. 719 c. etc.

ing completed in time past, a Greek must say ἀκήκοα. Ἀπέχω, in the same way, may be translated by *accepisse*, Matt. vi. 2, 5, 16; Phil. iv. 18, it is properly, however, like *weghaben* in German (have already, or in full, received), Wyttenbach, Plutarch. Mor. II. 124; Palair. p. 25.

5. The Aorist (E. A. Fritsch, de aoristi vi ac potest. Frcf. 1837. 4to.; H. Schmidt, der griech. Aorist in s. Verhältnissen zu d. übrigen Zeitformen. Halle, 1845. 8vo.) is used,

a. In narration for the Pluperfect (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 157; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 98 and Lucian. Alex. p. 106; Kühner, Gr. II. 79):

α. in subordinate clauses specifying time; as, Acts v. 24 ὡς ἤκουσαν τ. λόγους . . . διηπόρουν, Luke vii. 1 ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν τὰ ῥήματα . . . εἰσῆλθεν (ii. 39; xxii. 66; Jno. vi. 16; ix. 18; xiii. 12; xxi. 9; Acts xxi. 26), cf. Thuc. 1, 102 οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι . . . ἐπειδὴ ἀνεχώρησαν . . . ξύμμαχοι ἐγένοντο, Aesch. ep. 1. p. 121 c.; Mdv. 113 f.

β. in relative clauses; as, Acts i. 2 ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις οὓς ἐξελέξατο, ix. 35 [Matt. ii. 9 ὃν εἶδον, xxvii. 55 αἵτινες ἠκολούθησαν] Jno. xi. 30; iv. 45, 46; Luke xix. 15; xxiv. 1; Mdv. 114. Thus probably are the Aorists to be rendered also in a clause with ὅτι, Jno. vi. 22; see the expositors. The reason of this usage is, that the Greeks (who in such cases seldom or never employ the Pluperfect, Bhdy. 380) viewed the occurrence merely as past, not in relation to another occurrence also past. The Aor. is thus used in independent clauses, when they contain supplementary remarks, 291
Matt. xiv. 3 f. Whether this also applies to Jno. xviii. 24, cannot be decided on grammatical grounds. In Matt. xxvi. 48 ἔδωκεν is probably not to be rendered as a Pluperf. (Fr.), see BCrus. and Mey. On the contrary, the Pluperf. is regularly employed in such clauses even in the N. T.: Jno. xi. 19, 57; viii. 20; Acts ix. 21; Mark xiv. 44; Matt. vii. 25.

With very great want of judgment Haab S. 95 (cf. also Pasor S. 235) refers to this head a number of other passages, in which either the Aor. 259
retains its original import, or is owing to a somewhat different account of 7th ed.
one Evangelist which must not be arbitrarily harmonized with the others' narrative; as, Jno. xviii. 12 συνέλαβον τὸν Ἰησοῦν. According to the other Evangelists (Matt. xxvi. 50 f.; Mark xiv. 46) the seizing and binding preceded Peter's striking with his sword. John, however, may wish to imply that Peter interposed with his sword at the moment when the guard were laying hands on Jesus. On Matt. xxvii. 37 καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην de Wette very appropriately remarks: "This, as respects the matter of fact, is to be considered as a 247
Plup. — (though we must admit it to be possible that the narrator of this. 6th ed.

not himself an eye-witness, may have supposed that the affixing of this superscription did not take place until this time), but according to the language it is a simple preterite. *The narrator here does not observe the order of time.* That the Evangelist does not exactly follow the order of time is obvious besides from this, that after he has made the soldiers sit down to watch Jesus, he proceeds vs. 38 to introduce the crucifixion of the two robbers: τότε σταυροῦνται, κ.τ.λ. Should this also be regarded as a Plup.?" In Mark iii. 16 ἐπέθηκε τῷ Σίμωνι ὄνομα Πέτρον is not to be translated by *imposuerat;* for Mark had not yet recorded the circumstance, and it must not be thus as a matter of course supplied from John (i. 43). Also in Acts vii. 5 ἔδωκεν is not to be taken as a Plup.; this is manifest from the antithesis: *he gave not ... but promised.* It seems equally unnecessary to take the Aor. as Plup. in Acts iv. 4; viii. 2; xx. 12.[1] As to Mark xvi. 1 compared with Luke xxiii. 56, see Fr.

That the Aorist stands for the Perfect cannot be shown with certainty from any passage. Luke i. 1 ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ... ἔδοξε κἀμοί must be taken in the narrative style: *as many undertook ... I too determined,* etc. So also ii. 48 τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ... ἐζητοῦμέν σε. More plausible instances are the following: xiv. 18 ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα, 19 ζεύγη βοῶν ἠγόρασα etc., Phil. iii. 12 οὐχ ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον ἢ ἤδη τετελείωμαι, Jno. xvii. 4 ἐγώ σε ἐδόξασα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα, etc. But in all these the action is exhibited merely as come to pass, as occupying a single point of
292 time past, simply as gone by, (in Luke, as above, in contrast with a present action) I *bought* a field, a yoke of oxen, etc. In Phil. as above in particular, ἔλαβον seems to denote merely the attaining of the goal as an honorable achievement, while τετελ. denotes its consequences. Likewise in Rom. xiv. 9; Rev. ii. 8 the Aorists are simply narrative, and in reference to the death of Christ the Perfect could not even be used here. In Mark xi. 17 the Perf. is now in the text; but the Aorist also would be appropriate, see Fr. As to Greek usage, cf. Böckh, Pind. III. 185; Schaef. Eurip. Phoen. p. 15; Mtth. 1118. It often depends on the writer which of the two
260 tenses he will use, as the difference between them is sometimes very
7th ed. slight, cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 6, 14; Dion. H. IV. 2320; Alciphr. 3, 46. (The Codd. occasionally vary — as well those of the Greek authors, see e.g. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 434, 566, as those of the N. T. — between the Aorist and the Perfect, e.g. Jno. vi. 32; 1 Cor. ix. 15).[2]

[1] *Markland* (explicatt. vett. aliq. loc. in the Leipzig reprint of his edition of Eurip. Suppl. p. 326) erroneously refers to this head Matt. xxviii. 17 οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν also, on which see *Valcken.* annot. crit. p. 350.

[2] If in Matt. xxi. 20 πῶς be taken as an exclamation (*quam*), ἐξήρανται might have been expected instead of ἐξηράνθη, as in Mark xi. 21 according to good Codd. But the latter passage is not entirely parallel, and Matt. xxi. 20 is probably to be rendered: *how did the fig-tree wither suddenly?* They desire an *explanation* of what (according to this Evangelist's narrative) had taken place before their eyes. The disciples therefore allude to the fact of ξηραιν., and not to the consequences.

b. It is only in appearance that the Aorist is used for the Future 248
(Hm. Vig. p. 747. cf. above 4. b.),[1] e.g. Jno. xv. 6 ἐὰν μή τις μείνῃ 6th ed.
ἐν ἐμοί, ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα in such case (should that have happened) *he* (was) *is cast away*, not *he will be cast away* (the not abiding has this as its instantaneous consequence: whoever has severed himself from Christ, resembles a branch broken off and thrown away. With this βληθῆναι the Presents συνάγουσιν etc. are connected). Cf. as to this passage Hm. de emend. p. 192 sq. and Vig. as above. Rev. x. 7 ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθη τὸ μυστήριον, in the mouth of the angel describing the future: *then is finished the mystery*, 1 Cor. vii. 28. Cf. Eurip. Med. 78 ἀπωλόμεσθ' ἄρ', εἰ κακὸν προσοίσομεν νέον παλαιῷ, Plat. Gorg. 484 a. The Aor. never occurs in this sense without an antecedent clause. In Jno. xvii. 18 ἀπέστειλα is *I sent* them *forth* (which took place when the apostles were chosen). In xiii. 31 Jesus says: νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, the traitor Judas having gone away and as it were already completed his treason. In Mark iii. 21 ἐξέστη has the force of the Present *insanit*, cf. vs. 22. Jude 14 is a verbatim quotation from the (Greek) book of Enoch, and the Aor. represents the coming of Christ as having already taken place. In Rom. viii. 30 ἐδόξασε is used, because he in reference to whom God has completed the δικαιοῦν has also already obtained from God the 293
δοξάζεσθαι, (though the δόξα as an actual possession will not be imparted to him until later).

1. Nowhere in the N. T. does the Aorist express what *is wont* to be done (Schaef. Demosth. I. 247; Wex, Antig. I. 326; Mdv. 110). In Luke i. 51 God's μεγαλεῖα (vs. 49) are spoken of as already accomplished, only the respective parallel members must not be taken too rigidly in a historical sense. In Jno. viii. 29 οὐκ ἀφῆκέ με μόνον ὁ πατήρ means *the Father left me not alone* (on the earth), that is, he granted me, besides having sent me (πέμψας), also (hitherto) his unceasing aid. In 1 Jno. ii. 27 it is equally unnecessary to take ἐδίδαξεν as denoting *wont to teach;* Lücke in his 2d ed. has correctly explained the passage. As to Rom. viii. 30 see above. Heb. x. 5, 6 is a verbatim quotation from Ps. xl. applied to the fact of 261
Christ's εἰσερχ. εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Heb. i. 9 (Sept.) ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην etc. 7th ed.
contains the reason for the annexed διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε ὁ θεός, and the former is as strict an Aorist as the latter. Sooner might Jas. i. 11 ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος σὺν τῷ καύσωνι καὶ ἐξήρανε τὸν χόρτον etc. be referred to this head (cf. 1 Pet. i. 24), as has already been done by Piscator; but

[1] In 1 Cor. xv. 49 ἐφορέσαμεν might seem to stand for the Fut. Perf.; but Paul places himself in the point of view of the Parousia, and speaks in the narrative style of the life passed on earth.

the Aorists are narrative (representing the fact as having taken place), and taken together indicate the rapid succession of the events: *the sun rose, and* (immediately) *withered* etc. (Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 53), — scarcely was the sun risen, when it withered. Moreover, passages such as Eph. v. 29 form the transition to this use of the Aorist, which can be easily traced to the primary import of the tense (Hm. de emend. rat.
249 187). In Jas. i. 24 κατενόησεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθε καὶ εὐθέως ἐπελάθετο
6th ed. ὁποῖος ἦν neither the Aorist nor the Perfect is put for the Present, but the case supposed for illustration in vs. 23 is assumed as matter of fact, and the Apostle falls into the strain of narration.

2. Quite unnecessarily Pott maintains that in 1 Cor. ix. 20 ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος the Aor. is used for the Present. The Apostle states how he has hitherto acted. Heumann on 1 Cor. iv. 18, and many expositors on Jas. ii. 6 ἠτιμάσατε (which even Gebser renders by the Present), have made the same mistake. Tholuck's present view of Jno. xv. 8 ἐδοξάσθη is more correct than his former opinion; the Aorist is proleptic, as in Eph. ii. 6; Rom. viii. 30. In Matt. iii. 17 (xii. 18; xvii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 17) Sept. the Aorist εὐδόκησα may be taken naturally: my good pleasure fixed upon him, I took him into favor; see Mey. Hm. Vig. 746, No. 209, treats merely of poetic usage, and his remarks have with great discrimination been rendered still more clear and precise by Moller in the Zeitschrift f. Alterth.-Wiss. 1846, No. 134–136.

In epistles ἔγραψα, as is well known, is used for γράφω, like scripsi in Latin, in reference to the epistle which is just being written. In the same way ἔπεμψα *misi* is used, out of regard for the fact that to the receiver of
294 the epistle the πέμπω has become an ἔπεμψα. As to the latter, compare in the N. T. Acts xxiii. 30; Phil. ii. 28, ἀνέπεμψα Philem. 11, probably also συνεπέμψαμεν 2 Cor. viii. 18 (Demosth. ep. 3; Alciphr. 3, 30 and 41); as similar, ἠβουλήθην 2 Jno. 12. On the other hand, not even ἔγραψα in 1 Cor. v. 11 can be quoted as an instance of that use. This Aorist, rather, refers in all cases either to a previous epistle (1 Cor. v. 9; 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4, 9; vii. 12; 3 Jno. 9), or to an epistle already brought to its conclusion (Rom. xv. 15; Philem. 19; Gal. vi. 11; 1 Pet. v. 12), or even to a series of verses just finished (1 Cor. ix. 15; 1 Jno. ii. 21, 26; v. 13). For an epistle in course of being written γράφω is more usual, 1 Jno. ii. 12, 13; 1 Cor. iv. 14; xiv. 37; 2 Cor. xiii. 10, etc. As to 1 Jno. ii. 13 f. see Lücke. In the Greek writers also this use of the Aor. (or Perf.) for the Pres. is not carefully observed; cf. Diog. L. 7, 9. See Wyttenbach, Plut. Moral. I. 231 sq. Lips.

262 3. Lastly, the Aor. is not employed *de conatu*[1] (Kühnöl) in Mark ix. 17
7th ed. ἤνεγκα τὸν υἱόν μου. These words denote: *I brought my son* to thee (and I present him now to thee). That ἐξῆλθε Jno. xi. 44 need not be thus

[1] *Schaef.* Plut. IV. 398 declares himself against *Hm.* Soph. Aj. 1105. Yet cf. *Hm.* Iphig. Taur. p. 109.

explained, has been perceived by Kühnöl himself; and Tholuck very properly takes no notice of such an interpretation. On Matt. xxv. 1 see Mey.

6. The FUTURE[1] does not always denote pure and actual futurity, but sometimes what is possible (as futurity and possibility are 250
closely related) and in fact what *may* or *should* take place (ethical 6th ed.
possibility), Hm. Vig. p. 747; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 134; Krü. 156. This is particularly the case in questions. Owing, however, to the great resemblance between the Future and the Aor. Subjunctive and the variations in MSS., the passages in question are not all established. Luke xxii. 49 *κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ are we to smite*, etc.? (strictly, *shall* we — with thy permission — smite, wilt thou allow us to smite? cf. Eurip. Io 771 *εἴπωμεν ἢ σιγῶμεν; ἢ τί δράσομεν;*), Rom. x. 14 *πῶς οὖν ἐπικαλέσονται, εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; how can they call*, etc.? iii. 6 *ἐπεὶ πῶς κρινεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον;* Jno. vi. 68; Matt. xii. 26; 1 Tim. iii. 5; 1 Cor. xiv. 16 (Plat. Lys. 213 c. *τί οὖν δὴ χρησόμεθα*, Lucian. Tox. 47 *πῶς οὖν . . . χρησόμεθα τοῖς παροῦσι*). On the other hand, in Matt. vii. 24 *ὁμοιώσω* retains the simple force of the Fut., as does *τολμήσω* in Rom. xv. 18. In Rom. v. 7 something is expressed which is never likely to take place. 1 Cor. viii. 8 is similar. In Rom. vi. 1 and 15 the Subjunctive is 295
the preferable reading, as also in Luke iii. 10; Jno. vi. 5; but in Rom. vi. 2 the authority for *ζήσομεν* predominates, and the Future here forms a distinct contrast to the Aor. *ἀπεθάνομεν*. Mark iv. 13 and 1 Cor. xiv. 7 are strict Futures. In Matt. vii. 16 *ἐπιγνώσεσθε* does not contain a precept (ye *shall*), but a simple reference to what time itself will show: by their fruits ye *will* know them (as ye observe them, in the course of your observations). In Rom. vi. 14 the Fut. expresses an assurance and is essentially connected with the Apostle's reasoning. 1 Cor. xv. 29 *ἐπεὶ τί ποιήσουσιν οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν* is probably to be rendered: *else* (if Christ is not risen) *what will they do* (what are they about to do, what do they purpose) *who get themselves baptized over the dead* (are therefore in such case deluded)? The Pres. *ποιοῦσιν* is manifestly a correction. The phrase *τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν* always means *quid dicemus?* not quid dicamus. 1 Cor. xiv. 15 *προσεύξομαι τῷ πνεύματι, προσεύξομαι δὲ καὶ νοΐ* expresses not a resolution (*προσεύξωμαι* is 263
probably only a correction), but a Christian maxim which the be- 7th ed.

[1] The 3d Fut. Pass. *κεκράξομαι* occurring once (Luke xix. 40) in not a few Codd. stands for the 1st Fut., which in this verb is not in use, and has not the meaning which this form has in other cases (Mtth. 1118 f.; Mdv. 114; Janson, de graeci serm. paulo post futuro. Rastenburg, 1844. 4to.).

liever intends to follow, and is more decided than the Subjunctive. In 2 Cor. iii. 8 ἔσται refers to future δόξα. (As to such phrases as θέλεις ἑτοιμάσομεν and τί αἱρήσομαι οὐ γνωρίζω, where the Subjunctive also would be suitable, see § 41 **a.** 4, p. 285 and **b.** 4, p. 299.)

In the phrase ἐρεῖ τις *dicat* aliquis 1 Cor. xv. 35 ; Jas. ii. 18, the Fut. denotes a merely supposable case. But the Greek idiom is here more precise than the Latin : *some one will say*, I foresee it, I expect nothing else. So ἐρεῖς οὖν *dices igitur* Rom. ix. 19 ; xi. 19. Heb. xi. 32 ἐπιλείψει με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος is decidedly to be taken as a Future : time (I foresee) *will* fail me (*deficiet* me tempus, Philostr. her. p. 686 ἐπιλείψει με ἡ φωνή, cf. also longum *est* narrare for the German-Latin idiom longum *esset* etc.).[1] Also in Luke
251 6th ed. xi. 5 τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἕξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτὸν μεσονυκτίου the Fut. is appropriately used ; take away the interrogative form and the ordinary Future remains : none of you will go to his friend at midnight, such importunity will never take place. Lastly, in Matt. v. 39, 41 ; xxiii. 12 the notion of possibility is connected rather with ὅστις than with the Fut. ; and in Jas. ii. 10 the best Codd. [Sin. also] have the Subjunctive. (It would be altogether incongruous to take the Future as indicating nothing more than a *wish* in Rom. xvi. 20 ; Phil. iii. 15 ; iv. 7, 9, 19 ; Matt. xvi. 22.)

On the use of the Fut. for the Imperative, see § 43, 5, p. 315.

296 Some interpreters have preposterously asserted that the Fut. is used for the Preterite in Rev. iv. 9 ὅταν δώσουσι τὰ ζῶα δόξαν ... τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου ... πεσοῦνται οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι, etc. ; but the passage must be rendered : *when* (as often as) *the beasts shall give glory ... shall fall down.* On the other hand, the Fut., in expressing general truths, sometimes very nearly assumes the import of the Present ; as, Gal. ii. 16 ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σάρξ, Rom. iii. 20 : this is a rule which (since the introduction of Christianity) *will hold true* in the world. Substantially so also in Rom. iii. 30 ἐπείπερ εἷς ὁ θεός, ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως etc., where δικαιοῦν is regarded as an act of God which in the Christian method of salvation will be constantly thus realized. In Luke i. 37 ἀδυνατήσει is used, in an allusion to the O. T., of that which belongs to no particular time, but will always hold true (Theocr. 27, 9 ; see Hm. emend. rat. p. 197), cf. Rom. vii. 3. But in Matt. iv. 4 ζήσεται after Deut. viii. 3 denotes rather a rule established by God : *shall live.*

Note 1. The connection of different tenses by καί (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 274 sq. ; Reisig, Oed. Col. 419 ; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 700 ; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 59 a.), which has already been illustrated incidentally in the

[1] The case is different when the thought is expressed in the Optative with ἄν, as in Dion. H. 10, 2086 ἐπιλείποι ἄν με ὁ τῆς ἡμέρας χρόνος.

above examples, is partly to be accounted for by the fact that when an author is writing without rigorous exactness any one of several tenses may be employed without difference in the sense; and is partly intentional (Heb. ii. 14; 1 Cor. x. 4; xv. 4; Jas. i. 24; Jno. iii. 16; Phil. iii. 7 sq.; 1 Pet. iv. 6, etc.). The former, perhaps, is the case in Rev., as iii. 3; xi. 10; xii. 4; xvi. 21, etc. In none of these passages are the tenses used incorrect; and should any one discover something altogether extraordinary in *such* combinations (as e.g. Eichhorn, Einl. ins N. T. II. 378), he would only betray his defective knowledge of the Greek language. See my exeget. Studien I. 147 f. 264 7th ed.

Note 2. The tenses are used in the significations above elucidated for the most part only in the Indicative (and Participle) (Hm. emend. p. 189). In the other moods, particularly the Subjunctive, Optative, Imperative, the Aorist rarely denotes past time (1 Pet. iv. 6?), but generally retains, in distinction from the Present, only the notion of transientness or instantaneousness (cf. Pres. and Aor. Jno. iii. 16) Hm. Vig. 748, without reference to any definite time, Rost 587; Mdv. 109.

§ 41. THE INDICATIVE, SUBJUNCTIVE, AND OPTATIVE MOODS.[1] 252 6th ed.

1. According to Hermann, these moods are distinguished from each other as follows: The Indicative denotes what is *actual*, the Subjunctive and Optative what is *possible* merely: — the Subjunctive, what is *objectively* possible (the realization of which depends on circumstances);[2] the Optative, what is *subjectively* possible (simply conceived of, as e.g. a wish),[3] Hm. emend. rat. I. 205 sqq.; ad Vig. 901 sq., more fully de particula ἄν p. 76 sq.;[4] cf. also Schneider, Vorles. I. 230 ff.[5] With Klotz, ad Devar., we have adhered to 297

[1] Cf. *K. H. A. Lipsius*, comm. de modorum usu in N. T. P. I. Lips. 1827. 8vo.

[2] "In conjunctivo sumitur res experientia comprobanda . . .; conjunctivus est debere quid fieri intelligentis ac propterea exspectantis quid eveniat" *Hm.* partic. ἄν p. 77.

[3] *Klotz*, Devar. II. 104: Optativus modus per se non tam optationis vim in se continet, quam cogitationis omnino, unde proficiscitur etiam omnis optatio. *Hm.* partic. ἄν p. 77: Optativus est cogitantis quid fieri, neque an fiat neque an possit fieri quaerentis.

[4] P. 77: Apertum est, in indicativo veritatem facti ut exploratam respici, in conjunctivo rem sumi experientia comprobandam, in optativo veritatis rationem haberi nullam, sed cogitationem tantummodo indicari. How *Kühner* combines this distinction between the Subjunctive and Optative with an original *temporal* import of both cannot be here explained in detail (Griech. Gr. II. 87 f.).

[5] In the following works views quite different from this are maintained: *W. Scheuerlein*, über den Charakter des Modus in der gr. Sprache. Halle 1842. 4to. (a Program). *W. Bäumlein*, über die gr. Modi und die Partikeln κεν u. ἄν. Heilbronn 1846. 8vo. (see *Jahn*, Jahrb. Bd. 47. S. 353 f. and Zeitschr. f. Alterthumswiss. 1848. 104–106; 1849. 30–33). *Aken*, Grundzüge der Lehre von Tempus u. Modus im Griech. Güstrow 1850.

265 this theory, as nothing *in all respects* better seems yet to have been
7th ed. propounded; — least of all by Madvig.

In the N. T. these moods in their main distinctions, are employed with strict propriety (Hwiid to the contrary; — whom Kühnöl ad Acta p. 777 quotes with approval). Only it is noticeable that the Optative, as in the later Greek authors who do not aim at classic refinement, is partially set aside (more still than in Josephus), and in certain constructions is superseded by the Subjunctive.[1]

298 a. IN INDEPENDENT PROPOSITIONS.

2. The use of the INDICATIVE in independent propositions is very
253 simple even in classic Greek. In reference to the N. T., accordingly,
6th ed. we have on this head but two remarks to make:

a. The Imperfect Indicative is sometimes employed, as in Latin (Zumpt, S. 446), where we should use the Subjunctive; as, 2 Cor. xii. 11 *ἐγὼ ὤφειλον ὑφ' ὑμῶν συνίστασθαι* debebam commendari *I ought to have been commended*, Matt. xxv. 27 *ἔδει σε βαλεῖν thou oughtest to have put* etc. (2 Cor. ii. 3; Acts xxiv. 19; xxvii. 21), Matt. xxvi. 9 *ἠδύνατο τοῦτο πραθῆναι* etc., xxvi. 24 *καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη it were good for him* (would have been), satius erat, 2 Pet. ii. 21 *κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης* (Aristoph. nub. 1215; Xen. Anab. 7, 7, 40; Philostr. Apoll. 7, 30; Lucian. dial. mort. 27, 9; Diog. L. 1, 64), Acts xxii 22 *οὐ γὰρ καθῆκεν αὐτὸν ζῆν he should not have lived* (i.e. he ought to have been put to death long ago), non debebat or debuerat vivere, cf. Mtth. 1138 f.; Stallb. Plat. Symp. p. 74. The Greeks and Latins here merely state what, independently of circumstances, *was proper*, what *should* or *should not* have taken place; and the reader, by combining this statement with the actual fact, infers the disapproval of the latter. The Germans (and English) start from the present state of the matter, and by the Subjunctive express disapproval of its origin. Both moods therefore are correct in thought. It must not, however, be supposed that in such Greek constructions there is an omission of *ἄν*; for such expressions to the mind of a Greek exclude all thought of a condition under which something would have been good or must have happened; see Hm. partic. *ἄν* § 12.

4to. Cf. also *Doederlein* on Moods and Conjunctions, in his Reden u. Aufsätze. Erlangen 1843. 8vo. nr. 9.

[1] Modern Greek has, as is well known, wholly given up the Optative; and it is still a question how far it was used in the popular speech of the ancient Greeks. It is often the case that certain forms and constructions embodying refinements of the literary diction are persistently shunned by the people.

Ἐβουλόμην etc. vellem, (without ἄν), is to be explained somewhat differently, e.g. Acts xxv. 22 ἐβουλόμην καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀκοῦσαι *I too should wish to hear the man* (the account of him having awakened my curiosity), Aristoph. ran. 866; Aeschin. Ctesiph. 274 b.; Arrian. Epict. 1, 19, 18; Lucian. dial. mort. 20, 4; abdic. 1; Char. 6, etc. There is expressed here, not a desire which has been active at some former time merely (under different circumstances) *volebam*, but a wish still felt by the speaker. This, however, is not stated directly (*volo*), for this can be done only when the performance is viewed as dependent solely on the will (1 Tim. ii. 8; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; Rom. xvi. 19, etc.); nor by means of ἐβουλόμην ἄν, for this would imply the counterpart *but I will not*, Hm. partic. ἄν p. 66 sq., nor yet by the much weaker βουλοίμην ἄν (Xen. Oec. 6, 12; Krü. 163), *velim, I could wish;* but definitely: *I was wishing, wished*, that is, if it were proper, if thou wouldst permit it (and wish accordingly on this assumption), Bhdy. S. 374; Kühner II. 68, (a conditional clause, therefore, being understood).[1] So also Rom. ix. 3 ηὐχόμην γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου *optarem ego* etc., and Gal. iv. 20, see my Comment. in loc. (It is otherwise in 2 Cor. i. 15; Philem. 13, 14, where the Aorists express what actually took place, and in 2 Jno. 12 ἠβουλήθην.)

266 7th ed. 299 254 6th ed.

In Jno. iv. 4 etc. ἔδει is to be taken as a genuine Imperf. Indicative, denoting a real fact. On the contrary, in Heb. ix. 26 ἐπεὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν πολλάκις παθεῖν the particle ἄν might have been expected, as something is expressed that according to a certain supposition must have taken place. The Codd., however, do not give it, and it can be omitted, — just as we say: *for* (otherwise), if that were the design, *he must have often suffered* (cf. Hm. Eurip. Bacch. p. 152; Bhdy. 390, see § 42, 2). In Rom. xi. 6; 1 Cor. vii. 14; v. 10, the Indicatives Pres. after ἐπεί (*otherwise*, alioquin) are usually rendered as Subjunctives. The meaning, however, of the first two passages is simply this: *then* (in that case i.e. if ἐξ ἔργων) *grace is no longer grace; then* (in case the husband is not sanctified in the wife) *are your children unclean.* But in 1 Cor. v. 10 nearly all the better Codd. [Sin. also] read ὠφείλετε. See, further, Ast, Plat. legg. p. 162 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 57.

In 1 Cor. vii. 7 θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν the Indic.

[1] *Schoemann* ad Isaeum p. 435 takes a different view: Addita particula ἄν voluntatem significamus a conditione suspensam: *vellem, si liceret;* omissa autem particula etiam conditionis notio nulla subintelligitur, sed hoc potius indicatur, vere nos illud voluisse, etiamsi omittenda fuerit voluntas, scilicet quod frustra nos velle cognovimus. This nice distinction, however, might not be applicable to all passages.

θέλω is not used, as Pott maintains, for θέλοιμι or ἤθελον. Paul actually entertained this wish, directing his attention meantime merely to the advantage that would thus accrue to men (Christians), and not to the obstacles. Had he referred to the latter he must have said: *I could wish*, 267 or *I could have wished*, *velim* or *vellem*. Baumgarten has understood the 7th ed. passage correctly. In the same way we must explain 1 Cor. vii. 28, where φείδομαι is likewise explained by Pott as equivalent to φειδοίμην ἄν. All recent expositors have correctly explained 2 Cor. xii. 9 ἀρκεῖ σοι ἡ χάρις μου, which Luther inaccurately renders: *be satisfied with my grace*. The force of the Indicative has been exaggerated in another way in 1 Cor. v. 7: καθώς ἐστε ἄζυμοι esse *debetis*; incorrectly, see Mey.

3. The Indicative Pres. sometimes occurs also b. in direct questions where in Latin the Subjunctive (in German the auxiliary verb *sollen*) would be used; as, Jno. xi. 47 τί ποιοῦμεν; ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρω- 300 πος πολλὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖ, *quid faciamus? what are we to do?* Lucian, pisc. 10; asin. 25. The Ind., however, here strictly denotes that something must undoubtedly be done (forthwith); so we say, *what are we doing?* more resolute and emphatic than *what shall we do?* Τί ποιῶμεν is the question of one who invites to deliberation (cf. Acts iv. 16); τί ποιοῦμεν, on the contrary, is the language of one who on behalf of those concerned assumes the determination not only in general *to do* something, but also to do something definite, and desires simply to draw out a declaration of the specific thing. [That this distinction is not artificial, as Bttm. Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 180 asserts, has been justly acknowledged by Mey., also, in loc.] On this (rhetorical) Ind. Pres., which mainly occurs in conversation, see Heind. Plat. Gorg. p. 109 and Theaet. p. 449; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 141; Bhdy. 396.

The Greeks go still further, and even say πίνομεν *we drink* i.e. *we are to drink*, when they mean to proceed to drink forthwith, when the cup has been already lifted up (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 559). Gal. vi. 10 however, ἐργαζόμεθα τὸ ἀγαθόν, which is the reading 255 in good Codd. viz. AB and which Lchm. has printed [but only in 6th ed. his stereotyp. ed.] can hardly serve as an instance of this usage; see Mey. As to Jno. xxi. 3, cf. § 40, 2, p. 265.

The meaning of 1 Cor. x. 22 ἢ παραζηλοῦμεν τὸν κύριον; which Schott still renders by the Subjunctive, is probably: *or do we provoke God?* is that the meaning of our conduct, to awaken God's wrath? παραζ. expresses, not what is still to take place (as Rück. takes it [and recently even Bttm. Gramm. d. N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 181 considers as not inappropriate]), but what is already actually taking place. Rom. viii. 24 ὃ βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; is not (Schott) quare insuper speret? for dropping the question

the passage means, not. *he may no longer hope for*; but: *he no longer hopes for.* On the Ind. Fut. for the Subjunctive, see § 40, 6, p. 279.

The Indicatives in Jas. v. 13 κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, ... ἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, denoting a case represented as real, are attended with no difficulty: *some one is afflicted among you, ... some one is sick among you,* etc. Demosth. cor. 351 c. (where a point of interrogation is not necessary, Krü. 160). In Greek authors, even a Preterite is used in this way, Mtth. 1155. 268 7th ed.

4. The SUBJUNCTIVE is used in independent propositions

a. When an invitation or resolution (conjunct. adhortativus) is expressed (Mtth. 1169); as, Jno. xiv. 31 ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν, xix. 24; 1 Cor. xv. 32 φάγωμεν καὶ πίωμεν, αὔριον γὰρ ἀποθνήσκομεν, Phil. iii. 15 ὅσοι οὖν τέλειοι, τοῦτο φρονῶμεν, 1 Thess. v. 6 γρηγορῶμεν καὶ νήφωμεν, Luke viii. 22. The Codd. occasionally vary between the Subjunct. and the Fut. Heb. vi. 3; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Jas. iv. 13, but in the first two passages there is preponderating evidence in favor of the Subjunctive.

b. In undetermined questions (conjunct. deliberativus, Mtth. 1170; Bhdy. 393; Kühner II. 102 f.); as, Mark xii. 14 δῶμεν ἢ μὴ δῶμεν; *shall we give or not give?* Rom. vi. 1 ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ; 1 Cor. xi. 22; also in the 3d and 2d Pers., as Luke xxiii. 31 εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται; and Matt. xxvi. 54 πῶς πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί; *how shall the Scriptures be fulfilled?* xxiii. 33 πῶς φύγητε (Jno. v. 47 var.). Under this head comes the Subjunctive in certain set phrases; as, Luke ix. 54 θέλεις εἴπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ; (Hm. de ellips. p. 183) *wilt thou that we, are we to bid* etc., Matt. xiii. 28; xxvi. 17; Mark xiv. 12; Luke xxii. 9. Cf. Eurip. Phoen. 722 βούλει τράπωμαι δῆθ' ὁδοὺς ἄλλας τινάς; Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 1 βούλει σκοπῶμεν; Aesch. Ctesiph. 297 c.; Lucian. dial. m. 20, 3. See also Matt. vii. 4 ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος etc. 1 Cor. iv. 21. It is a mistake to supply in such cases ἵνα or ὅπως (Lehmann, Lucian. III. 466). There is no ellipsis, any more than, for example, in the German *es scheint sie kommen, it seems they are coming.* In some passages, Codd. have the Fut., which, in these phrases, Greek authors do employ (Lucian. navig. 23), though not very frequently; see Lob. Phryn. p. 734, and Fr. Matt. p. 465, 761 (from the Sept. see Heb. viii. 5) cf. e.g. Exod. xxv. 40 ὅρα ποιήσεις κατὰ τὸν τύπον etc. 301

In questions, the Future instead of the Conjunct. deliberativus of the 3d Pers. is, according to the testimony of the Codd., more frequent in the N. T., see above, § 40, 6, and is to be retained even in Rom. x. 14 f.; 256 6th ed.

although in Greek authors the Subjunctive, in this person also, not unfrequently occurs (Stallb. Plat. Men. p. 103; Krü. 161): Soph. Aj. 403 *ποῖ τις φύγῃ;* Oed. Col. 170 *ποῖ τις φροντίδος ἔλθῃ;* (1st Pers. vs. 311); Plato, Soph. 225 a.; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 96. In Luke xi. 5 the Fut. Ind. and the Subjunctive are connected, *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἕξει φίλον καὶ πορεύσεται πρὸς αὐτόν ... καὶ εἴπῃ αὐτῷ;* see Mtth. 1171; Hm. partic. *ἄν* p. 87; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 26 and Phaed. p. 202; Bornem. Luc. p. 147; Bmln. p. 182.

Respecting Jas. iv. 15 *ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσωμεν (ζήσομεν) καὶ ποιήσωμεν (ποιήσομεν) τοῦτο ἢ ἐκεῖνο* a learned controversy has been carried on between Fritzsche (Leipz. Literatur-Zeit. 1824. S. 2316 and n. krit. Journ. V. S. 3 ff.) and Bornem. (n. krit. Journ. VI. S. 130 ff.). The former would make the conclusion begin at *καὶ ποιήσομεν* (adopting this as the preferable reading); the latter would make it begin at *καὶ ζήσωμεν* (re-
269 taining also *ποιήσωμεν*). Fritzsche renders the passage: *if the Lord will*
7th ed. *and we live, we shall also do this or that;* Bornem.: *if it please the Lord, let us seek our support, let us do this or that.* Every one must feel that there is something incongruous in the expression *if God will, we will live;* and B. himself has perceived this, as he translates *ζήσ. we will use life!* But this explanation appears forced, and not warranted by biblical usage. There is nothing remarkable in the occurrence of *καί* at the beginning of the apodosis (2 Cor. xi. 12). With regard to this, therefore, I must agree with Fr. But he should not have asserted that *ποιήσομεν*
302 is *far* better attested than *ζήσομεν*. The critical authorities are nearly equal. Only from Cod. Meerm. (by Dermout) *ποιήσομεν* (but not *ζήσομεν*) has been adduced, [and Cod. Sin. has *ποιήσομεν* together with *ζήσομεν*]. Considering the ease with which a mistake in transcribing might occur, we should probably adopt as the most suitable reading: *ἐὰν ὁ κύριος θελήσῃ καὶ ζήσωμεν, καὶ ποιήσωμεν* etc. (vs. 13).

5. The Optative is used in independent propositions when a wish is expressed; as, Acts viii. 20 *τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν*, Rom. xv. 5; Philem. 20 *ἐγώ σου ὀναίμην*, 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 2; 1 Thess. iii. 11 f.; v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 5; (in 2 Cor. ix. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 7 the Futures are to be restored, as is the Imperat. *λαβέτω* in Acts i. 20). As to the Sept. see some remarks in Thiersch p. 101. Cf. 1 Kings viii. 57; Ps. xl. 3; Tob. v. 14; x. 12; xi. 16.

Instead of the Optative, the Hebrew frequently employs a question to denote a wish; as, 2 Sam. xv. 4 *τίς με καταστήσει κριτήν utinam quis me constituat!* This construction, however, occurs also in Greek poets, Fr. Rom. II. 70. Yet it is on insufficient grounds that Rom. vii. 24 *τίς με ῥύσεται* etc. has been taken as a wish expressed in the form of a question. A question expressive of perplexity and conscious helplessness is here peculiarly appropriate, and requires no *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*.

b. USE OF THESE THREE MOODS IN DEPENDENT PROPOSITIONS. 257 6th ed.

1. The particles of *design* ἵνα and ὅπως (both which, however, strictly signify *quo modo, ut;* — respecting μή see below, § 56), are quite naturally construed with the Subjunctive and Optative (according to the distinction above pointed out between the two moods), as every design refers to the future, and, consequently, to something still to be carried into effect. The Indicative they can take — so long as the writer thinks correctly — only in the Future tense.[1]

In the N. T. these particles are usually followed by

a. The Subjunctive, and then *α.* not only after the Present, as Matt. vi. 2 ποιοῦσιν ... ὅπως δοξασθῶσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 2 Tim. ii. 4 οὐδεὶς στρατευόμενος ἐμπλέκεται ταῖς τοῦ βίου πραγματείαις, ἵνα τῷ στρατολογήσαντι ἀρέσῃ, 10 πάντα ὑπομένω διὰ τ. ἐκλεκτούς, 270 7th ed. ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ σωτηρίας τύχωσι (Mark iv. 21; Luke viii. 12; Rom. xi. 25; 1 Jno. i. 3; Heb. ix. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 29; Gal. vi. 13; the Subjunctive here denoting — Hm. Vig. 850 — what was regarded as a consequence actually about to take place, what was in fact and immediately designed, consequently what is objectively possible), and after the Imperat. and the Fut., as 1 Tim. iv. 15 ἐν τούτοις 303 ἴσθι, ἵνα σου ἡ προκοπὴ φανερὰ ᾖ, Matt. ii. 8 ἀπαγγείλατέ μοι, ὅπως κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ, v. 16; xiv. 15; Acts viii. 19; xxiii. 15; 1 Cor. iii. 18; 1 Jno. ii. 28; Jno. v. 20 μείζονα τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα, ἵνα ὑμεῖς θαυμάζητε, Phil. i. 26, also after the Conjunct. adhort. or deliber., as in Rom. iii. 8; Luke xx. 14; Jno. vi. 5, etc., — all in accordance with the preceding remarks, and quite regular (Hm. Vig. 850); — but also *β.* after the Preterite, when the latter denotes a really past time[2] (cf. Gayler, de partic. gr. sermon. negat. p. 176 sq.), and there occasionally can be perceived a reason for selecting *this* mood instead of the Optative (Hm. Vig. 791; Krü. 166).[3] Accordingly, in the following passages the Subjunctive may denote an action still *continuing* either in itself or in its results, or one frequently recurring (Hm. Vig. 850 and ad Eurip. Hecub. p. 7; Heind. Plat. Protag. § 29; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 103;

[1] See, in general, *Franke* in the Darmstädter Schulzeit. 1839. S. 1236 ff.; *Klotz*, Devar. II. 615 sqq.

[2] For where a Perfect has the sense of a Present, ἵνα or ὅπως with the Subjunctive cannot be surprising, Jno. vi. 38; Luke xvi. 26; Acts ix. 17; 1 Jno. v. 20.

[3] Many other distinctions have been laid down by *Wex* in the epist. crit. ad Gesenium (Lips. 1831. 4to.) p. 22 sqq. The question arises, however, whether such nice distinctions are consistent with the character of a living language.

Ast, Plat. legg. p. 93; Klotz, Devar. II. 618): 1 Tim. i. 16 *ἠλεήθην, ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρώτῳ ἐνδείξηται Ἰ. Χριστὸς τὴν πᾶσαν μακροθυμίαν*, vs. 20 *οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδευθῶσι μὴ βλασφημεῖν*, Tit. i. 5 *κατέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα τὰ λείποντα ἐπιδιορθώσῃ*, ii. 14 *ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς*, Rom. vi. 4 *συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ, ἵνα ... καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν*, 1 Jno. iii. 5 *ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ*,
238 vs. 8 *ἐφανερώθη, ἵνα λύσῃ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ διαβόλου*, v. 13 *ταῦτα ἔγραψα*
8th ed. *ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε*; cf. Luke i. 4 (Plat. Crit. 43 b.; rep. 9, 472 c.; legg. 2, 653 d.; Xen. Mem. 1, 1, 8; Aelian. 12, 30). In other passages, e.g. Acts v. 26 *ἤγαγεν αὐτούς ... ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν*, Acts ix. 21 *εἰς τοῦτο ἐληλύθει, ἵνα ... ἀγάγῃ*, the Subjunctive may denote an intended result *of the occurrence of which the speaker entertained no doubt whatever;* cf. Mark viii. 6 *ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα παραθῶσι* (*that they might* ... which they could not refuse to do), xii. 2; Acts xxv. 26 *προήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐφ' ὑμῶν, ὅπως τῆς ἀνακρίσεως γενομένης σχῶ τί γράψω*. (The Optative would express a design of uncertain result, Mtth. 1182, 1184.) Lastly, the construction in Matt. xix. 13 *προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ τὰ παιδία, ἵνα τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιθῇ*
271 *αὐτοῖς*, Mark x. 13 *προσέφερον αὐτῷ παιδία, ἵνα ἅψηται αὐτῶν* is
7th ed. perhaps to be explained by the fact that the Greeks in narration sometimes introduce the opinions of another in direct discourse, or
304 at least as though he himself were still present, and consequently employ the same moods which he would have used (Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 502, 504; Poppo, Xen. Cyrop. p. 189 sq. and Thuc. I. I. 141 sq.); so here: *that he may lay his hands upon them*, instead of *might lay* (Optative). The reader is thus more vividly made as it were a beholder of the scene described (Klotz, as above, pp. 618 sq. 682); cf. Jno. xviii. 28; Matt. xii. 14. As, however, the Optative never occurs in the N. T. in this (*β.*) very common construction, we are by no means warranted in ascribing to the sacred writers this nice distinction. They seem, rather, to have unconsciously avoided the Optative — a mood which becomes more and more rare in the later language, and in the popular speech perhaps never conformed to the rules of literary Attic — even where a more cultivated taste in such matters would have certainly given it the preference (e.g. Jno. iv. 8; vii. 32; Luke vi. 7; xix. 4; 2 Cor. viii. 6; Heb. ii. 14; xi. 35; Phil. ii. 27, etc.). Even Plutarch, in the above construction, usually employs the Subjunctive,[1]

[1] Even in the earlier authors particles of design are more frequently construed with the Subjunctive after a Preterite than was formerly admitted. See *Bremi*, Lys. exc. 1. p. 435 sqq.

and in the Hellenistic language it is everywhere the predominant mood, as may be seen from every page of the Sept., Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, etc. (Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 47).

b. The Indicative Future (after a Pres. and Perf. cf. Hm. Vig. 851); as, Rev. xxii. 14 *μακάριοι οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ἔσται ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν* etc. (the Subjunctive immediately follows), iii. 9; vi. 11; xiv. 13 (var.); Jno. xvii. 2 *ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν ... ἵνα ... δώσει αὐτοῖς* (al. *δώσῃ*), 1 Pet. iii. 1; 1 Cor. xiii. 3 (var); Gal. ii. 4 (var.). Compare, further, the variants in Rev. viii. 3; ix. 20; xiii. 16; xiv. 13, (on the other hand, in the O. T. quotation Eph. vi. 3 the construction is continued in the oratio directa at *ἔσῃ*, which accordingly must not be supposed to depend on *ἵνα*. In the same way may be explained also the var. *ἐξαναστήσει* and *καθίσεσθε* in Mark xii. 19 and Luke xxii. 30). The Fut. with *ὅπως* never occurs in the N. T. (for *ὅπως ... ζήσεται* Mark v. 23 has little authority); but this is a construction not unfrequent in 259
Greek authors, as Xen. A. 3, 1, 18; Theophr. char. 22; Isocr. 6th ed.
perm. 746; Dem. Mid. 398 b.; Soph. Philoct. 55; cf. Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 498; Klotz as above, p. 683 sq.; Gayler de partic. negat. p. 211, 321; Rost 647 f., and the Fut. then usually denotes a *continuing* state, while the Aor. Subjunct. is used of something quickly passing by. This construction with *ἵνα* also appears correct to Elmsley, Eurip. Bacch. p. 164; see, on the other hand, 305
Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. 155, and de partic. *ἄν* p. 134; Klotz, Devar. II. 630 — (in all the passages referred to this head *ἵνα* may be 272
conveniently rendered by *ubi* or *where*). Instances of this con- 7th ed.
struction actually occur in the later writers (Cedren. II. 136), the Fathers (Epiph. II. 332 b.), and the Apocrypha (Evang. apocr. p. 437; Thilo, apocr. 682); cf. Schaef. Demosth. IV. 273. In the N. T. this mood, according to the above passages, is pretty well established, though owing to Itacism the forms of the Ind. and of the Subj. might easily have been interchanged.

c. Lastly, the use of *ἵνα* in connection with the Present Ind.,[1] of which two instances occur almost without var. — 1 Cor. iv. 6 *ἵνα μάθητε ... ἵνα μὴ φυσιοῦσθε*, and Gal. iv. 17 *ζηλοῦσιν ὑμᾶς ... ἵνα αὐτοὺς ζηλοῦτε*, — is very surprising; for the Pres. Ind. after a particle of design seems illogical. Hence Fr. Matt. p. 836 sq. asserted that in both passages *ἵνα* is not the Conjunction, but the Adverb *ubi*; and this opinion, after Fr. had exchanged it as respects the

[1] *Valckenaer's* note on 1 Cor. confounds the Indic. Preterite, Future, and Present, and is consequently useless.

first passage for another (Fritzschior. Opusc. p. 186 sqq.),[1] Mey. has taken up again: *under which circumstances you* (then) *are not puffed up,* — *where* (in which case) *you are zealous in regard to them.* But, apart from the fact that in the whole Greek Bible ἵνα never once occurs as an Adverb of place, the Pres. in both passages would be surprising, and also in the first passage οὐ would rather be expected. Moreover in both passages, as Mey. himself admits, ἵνα denoting design is far more in accordance with the Apostle's meaning. I think, therefore, that this use of ἵνα with the Ind. Pres. must be regarded as an impropriety of later Greek,[2] — although the passage from Acta Ignat. ed. Ittig. p. 538 does not furnish satisfactory proof, as ἀπολοῦνται might be taken for the Attic Fut. if necessary, and in Geopon. 10, 48, 3; Himer. 15, 3 the Ind. may have arisen easily from the Subjunct. by a mistake of the scribe. On the other hand, in later works ἵνα with the Ind. Pres. occurs so frequently as to preclude the supposition that every instance is a mistake of transcribers; see Malal. 10, p. 264 ἐπιτρέψας ἵνα πάντες ... βαστάζουσιν, 12, p. 300 ἐποίησε κέλευσιν ἵνα ... χρηματίζουσι, Acta Pauli et Petri 7 προάγει, ἵνα μία πόλις ἀπόλλυται, 20 ἐδίδαξα
306 ἵνα τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγοῦνται, Acta Pauli et Thecl. p. 45 ἵνα
260 γάμοι μὴ γίνονται ἀλλὰ οὕτως μένουσιν, Evang. apocr. p. 447.[3] And
6th ed. this construction has further forced its way even into the N. T.,
273 good Codd. having in Jno. xvii. 3 ἵνα ... γινώσκουσι. [Cf. besides,
7th ed. Gal. vi. 12 ἵνα μὴ διώκονται, Tit. ii. 4 ἵνα σωφρονίζουσιν, Rev. xiii. 17 ἵνα μή τις δύναται in Tischendorf's text, and 2 Pet. i. 10 ἵνα ποιεῖσθε in Lachmann's.] Either, therefore, Paul actually wrote thus (yet see Bengel on 1 Cor. iv.), or the forms were introduced in these passages by transcribers at an early date. It is worthy of remark, however the case may be, that in both instances the verb ends in οω.

When the Optative (after a Pres.) follows ἵνα, as in Eph. iii. 16 κάμπτω τὰ γόνατά μου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα τοῦ κυρίου ... ἵνα δῴη ὑμῖν etc. (where, however, very good Codd. [Sin. too] have δῷ) i. 17, ἵνα is not strictly a particle of design; but the clause which it commences expresses the object of the wish and prayer (*that he may give*), and the Opt., as modus optandi, is selected on this very account; see Harless on Eph. i. 17. Yet the Opt. is used even after ἵνα or ὅπως *in order that*, when it depends on a clause

[1] He adopts the emendation ἕνα μὴ ... φυσιοῦσθαι (for ἵνα μὴ ... φυσιοῦσθε); but against this see *Meyer*.

[2] Modern Greek, e.g. in the Confess. Orthod., usually puts the Ind. Present after νά or διὰ νά.

[3] Xen. Athen. 1, 11 ἵνα λαμβάνων μὲν πράττει (which *Sturz* still adduces in his Lexic. Xenoph.) was long ago changed into λαμβάνωμεν πράττει. See *Schneider* in loc.

expressive of a wish, Soph. Philoct. 325 and Aj. 1200; see Hm. on the latter passage, and Wex, epist. crit. p. 33. (In Eph. as above, it is unnecessary, with Lchm. and Fr. Rom. III. 230, to read δώῃ, an Ionic form of the Subjunctive which is not sufficiently established in the N. T.)

2. In HYPOTHETICAL sentences four kinds of construction occur (Hm. Vig. 834, 902):[1]

a. Pure condition: *if thy friend comes, give him my regards* (the case is put as real). Here the Indicative is used with εἰ; "quae particula per se nihil significat praeter conditionem," Klotz, Devar. 455, cf. p. 487.

b. Condition with assumption of *objective* possibility (where experience will decide whether or not it is real): *if thy friend should come* (I do not know whether he will come, but the result will show). Here ἐάν (εἰ ἄν see Hm. partic. ἄν p. 95 sqq.) with the Subjunctive is used.

c. Condition with assumption of *subjective* possibility, the condition existing merely in thought: *if thy friend come* (the case being conceivable and credible) *I should be pleased to present my* 307
respects to him. Here εἰ with the Optative is used.

d. Condition believed to be contrary to the fact: *were there a God, he would govern* (but there is not). *Had God existed from eternity, he would have prevented evil* (but he has not existed). Here εἰ with the Indicative is used, — the Imperf. in the first case, the Aor. or (much more rarely) the Plup. in the second (Krü. 170); in the conclusion likewise one of these two tenses. Why a Preterite 261
is used has been explained by Hm. Vig. 821, compare with this Stallb. 6th ed.
Plat. Euthyphr. p. 51 sq. In general, see Klotz, Devar. p. 450 sqq.

For ἐάν we sometimes find, as in Jno. xii. 32; xvi. 23; xx. 23; Luke 274
iv. 6 (where, however, Tdf. has made no remark), in good Codd. (as B) 7th ed.
ἄν, respecting which cf. Hm. Vig. 812, 822. It is also by no means rare in Greek authors, even in Attic, though these prefer ἤν, which does not occur in the N. T.

[1] See also ad Soph. Antig. 706; ad Soph. Oed. C. 1445; ad Eur. Bacch. 200. *Klossmann*, de ratione et usu enuntiator. hypothet. linguae gr. Vratisl. 1830. *Kiesling*, 2 Programm. de enunciatis hypothet. in lingua gr. et lat. Cizae, 1835. '45. 4to. *Recknagel*, zur Lehre von den hypothetischen Sätzen mit Rücksicht auf die Grundformen derselben in der griech. Sprache. Nürnberg, 1843 ff. III. 4to. Besides, it can easily be conceived that, in many sentences, either εἰ or ἐάν might be used with equal propriety, the selection depending on the writer. The later writers are not careful to discriminate between them. It may be worthy of remark, that Euclid almost always uses ἐάν with the Subjunctive of a case in Mathematics (respecting which no future experience is needed to decide).

The diction of the N. T. will be found entirely in accordance with the preceding rules; e.g.

a. *α.* Matt. xix. 10 *εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . οὐ συμφέρει γαμῆσαι*, 1 Cor. vi. 2; ix. 17; Rom. viii. 25; Col. ii. 5 (Pres. followed by Pres.); Matt. xix. 17 *εἰ θέλεις εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωήν, τήρει τὰς ἐντολάς*, viii. 31; xxvii. 40; Jno. vii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 9 (Pres. followed by Imperat.); Rom. viii. 11 *εἰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος Ἰησοῦν . . . οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν, ὁ ἐγείρας . . . ζωοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα, ὑμῶν*, Matt. xvii. 4; Acts xix. 39; Jno. v. 47 (Pres. followed by Fut.); 1 Cor. xv. 16 *εἰ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται if the dead do not rise* (I assume the case), *then is Christ also not risen*, xiii. 1; 2 Pet. ii. 20 (Rom. iv. 14) (Pres. followed by Perf.) cf. Demosth. ep. 3, p. 114 b.; Matt. xii. 26 *εἰ ὁ σατανᾶς τὸν σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλει, ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐμερίσθη*, cf. vs. 28; Luke xi. 20 (Pres. followed by Aor.) cf. Orig. de die domin. p. 3 Jani: *εἰ δὲ τοῦ ἔργου ἀπέχεις, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν δὲ οὐκ εἰσέρχῃ, οὐδὲν ἐκέρδανας.* *β.* Acts xvi. 15 *εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ κυρίῳ εἶναι, εἰσελθόντες . . . μείνατε* (Perf. followed by Imperat.); 2 Cor. v. 16 *εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν, ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐκέτι γινώσκομεν* (Perf. followed by Pres.; cf. Demosth. c. Boeot. p. 639 a.); Jno. xi. 12 *εἰ κεκοίμηται, σωθήσεται* (Perf. followed by Fut.), Rom. vi. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 5 *εἴ τις λελύπηκεν, οὐκ ἐμὲ λελύπηκεν* (Perf. followed by Perf.); vii. 14 *εἴ τι αὐτῷ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν κεκαύχημαι, οὐ κατῃσχύνθην* (Perf. followed by Aor.). *γ.* Rom. xv. 27 *εἰ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν*
308 *ἐκοινώνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι* etc., 1 Jno. iv. 11 (Aor. followed by Pres.); Jno. xviii. 23 *εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα, μαρτύρησον περὶ τοῦ κακοῦ*, Rom. xi. 17, 18; Col. iii. 1; Philem. 18 (Aor. followed by Imperat.); Jno. xiii. 32 *εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ, καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν*
262 *ἑαυτῷ*, xv. 20[1] (Aor. followed by Fut.). *δ.* Matt. xxvi. 33 *εἰ*
8th ed.

[1] In this passage: *εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσι· εἰ τὸν λόγον μου ἐτήρησαν, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον τηρήσουσι*, the translation *if they persecuted me, they will persecute you also*, etc. is the only correct one. The words appear to me to be simply a special application of the preceding thought, *οὐκ ἔστι δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ*: your lot will be like mine; there is but a single alternative: persecution or acceptance. The words themselves leave it for the moment undecided which of the two has befallen Jesus. What *follows*, however, shows how Jesus wished to be understood. Only it must not be overlooked that Jesus speaks of the conduct of the Jews *in general*, without reference to individual exceptions. According to a new exposition put forth by rector *Lehmann* in the Prog. lucubrationum sacrar. et profan. Pt. I. (Lübben, 1828. 4to.) a *vis proportionalis* is to be attributed to *εἰ*: quemadmodum me persecuti sunt, ita et vos persequentur; quemadmodum (prout) meam doctrinam amplexi observarunt, ita et vestram, etc. But this import of the particle should have been established by decisive examples (in Jno. xiii. 14, 32 such force it obviously has *not*). The writer seems to have confounded the simple comparative *ut . . . ita* (the parallel antithesis of two clauses standing in necessary correlation) with the proportional *prout, according as*. There is a difference between

πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται ἐν σοί, ἐγὼ οὐδέποτε σκανδαλισθήσομαι 275
(Fut. followed by Fut. like Isocr. Archid. p. 280; Porphyr. abstin. 7th ed.
1, 24); yet in Jas. ii. 11, where according to the received text the Fut. is followed by the Perf., probably the true reading would give Present tenses in the protasis. Such construction with the Fut. would approximate most nearly to that with ἐάν (Krü. 171); but *if all shall be offended in thee* is a more decided statement than *if all should be offended.* In the latter, it is still altogether uncertain whether they will be offended; in the former, this is assumed as a future fact (Christ has distinctly assured his disciples of this), cf. Hm. Vig. p. 900.

b. Ἐάν if an *objective* possibility with the expectation of a decision is to be expressed, always therefore in reference to something future (Hm. Vig. 834); as, Jno. vii. 17 ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται etc., Matt. xxviii. 14 ἐὰν ἀκουσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος, ἡμεῖς πείσομεν αὐτόν. Hence the consequent clause usually contains a Fut. (Matt. v. 13; Rom. ii. 26; 1 Cor. viii. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 15; or, what is equivalent, an Aor. with οὐ μή Acts xiii. 41; Jno. viii. 51 f.) or an Imperat. (Jno. vii. 37; Matt. x. 13; xviii. 17; Rom. xii. 20; xiii. 4), more rarely a Pres., and then either in the sense of a Fut. (Xen. A. 3, 2, 20) or denoting something permanent, Matt. xviii. 13; 2 Cor. v. 1, or a general truth, Mark iii. 27; 1 Cor. ix. 16; Jno. viii. 16, 54; Acts xv. 1 (Diog. Laert. 6, 44; 10, 152). Perfects in the conclusion become equivalent in sense to Presents, 309
Rom. ii. 25; vii. 2; Jno. xx. 23 (on Rom. xiv. 23 and Jno. xv. 6 see § 40, 4 b. 5 b.). The Aor. in the conclusion occurs in 1 Cor. vii. 28 ἐὰν δὲ καὶ γήμῃς, οὐχ ἥμαρτες *thou hast not sinned*, thou art not in this case a sinner. Cf. Mtth. 1203; Klotz, Devar. II. 451 sq. The Subjunctive depending on ἐάν may be a Subj. Pres. or a Subj. Aor. The latter (on the whole the more usual) is, for the most part, rendered in Latin by the Future Perfect.

That ἐάν 1 Cor. vii. 11, as Rück. maintains, refers to an event (possibly) already past, is a mistake, cf. Mey. In 2 Cor. x. 8 also Mey. has corrected Rückert's concessive acceptation of ἐάν.

c. Εἰ with the Optat. to denote *subjective* possibility (Hm. partic. ἄν p. 97); and, *a.* When a condition is regarded as frequently recurring (Klotz p. 492; Krü. 172), as 1 Pet. iii. 14 εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε

the two: In a free translation the first may be put for εἰ, but the latter is not comprehended in the import of εἰ or *si*; and every one must perceive that in the passage in question *L.* really takes εἰ in two senses, first simply as *ut* and then as *prout.* See also *Lücke* in loc.

διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι *even if ye should suffer*. Πάσχειν is designated here not as something occurring in the future, but merely as something that may very probably occur, regarded without any
276 reference to definite time (and in general as often as it may occur).
7th ed. Elsewhere only in parenthetical clauses, but with the same reference;
263 as, 1 Cor. xv. 37 σπείρεις ... γυμνὸν κόκκον, εἰ τύχοι (*if it should*
6th ed. *so chance*), σίτου (Dem. Aristocr. 436 c.; Lucian. navig. 44; amor. 42; Toxar. 4, see Jacob on the last passage, and Wetst. on 1 Cor. xv.), 1 Pet. iii. 17 κρεῖττον ἀγαθοποιοῦντας, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, πάσχειν, cf. Isocr. Nicocl. p. 52. β. After a Preterite when the condition is represented as the subjective purpose of the agent; as, Acts xxvii. 39 κόλπον τινὰ κατενόουν ἔχοντα αἰγιαλὸν εἰς ὃν ἐβουλεύοντο, εἰ δύναιντο, ἐξῶσαι τὸ πλοῖον, also Acts xxiv. 19 οὓς ἔδει ἐπὶ σοῦ παρεῖναι καὶ κατηγορεῖν, εἴ τι ἔχοιεν πρός με *if they had anything against me* (in their minds), Krü. 171. In Acts xx. 16 the Optat. might, in the same way, be expected; yet even in Greek authors sometimes (and that not merely in standing phrases, as εἰ δυνατόν ἐστι above) in orat. obliq. the Ind. is used; as, Ael. 12, 40 ἐκηρύχθη τῷ στρατοπέδῳ, εἴ τις ἔχει ὕδωρ ἐκ τοῦ Χοάσπου, ἵνα δῷ βασιλεῖ πιεῖν. cf. Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 156. Further, see no. 5 below. (After ἐάν in orat. obliq. nobody will expect the Opt. in the N. T. Acts ix. 2; Jno. ix. 22; xi. 57, Bttm. § 126, 8; yet cf. Hm. Vig. 822.)

For examples to d. see § 42.

310 The exceptions to these rules in the N. T. text are but very few, and occur for the most part only in particular Codd. They are the following:

a) εἰ is used with the Subjunctive[1] in 1 Cor. ix. 11 εἰ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν τὰ σαρκικὰ θερίσωμεν (according to good Codd.), xiv. 5 ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ (al. διερμηνεύει) *except* (in case that) *he interpret*, Rev. xi. 5 var. (Sir. xxii. 26).[2] The use of this mood after εἰ by Attic authors was long denied, but it is now admitted to occur even in prose; see Hm. Soph. Aj. 491 and de partic. ἄν p. 96; Poppo, Cyrop. p. 209 and Emend. ad Mtth. Gramm. (Frkf. on the Oder, 1832) p. 17; Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 463; Klotz, Devar. II. 500 sqq. The distinction between εἰ with the Subjunctive and ἐάν or

[1] Luke ix. 13 probably means: *unless perhaps we are to buy* some, and the mood does not depend on εἰ, — as elsewhere after the phrase ὥσπερ εἰ ἄν *Mtth.* 1205. Plat. Cratyl. 425 d. εἰ μὴ ἄρα δὴ ... καὶ ἡμεῖς ... ἀπαλλαγῶμεν would be similar; but others read ἀπαλλαγεῖμεν.

[2] In 1 Thess. v. 10 the text. rec. with all the better Codd. [Sin. also], has ἵνα, εἴτε γρηγορῶμεν εἴτε καθεύδωμεν, ἅμα σὺν αὐτῷ ζήσωμεν, where (after a Pret. in the principal clause) a more exact writer would have used the Opt. in both passages; cf. Xen. A. 2, 1, 14. Yet ἵνα with the Subj. is here used according to **b.** 1, and the Subj. in the secondary clause is accommodated to this.

ἤν is thus defined by Hm. (de partic. ἄν p. 97 and ad Soph. Oed. R. p. 52 sq. cf. Klotz as above 501) : εἰ puts the condition simply, but when used with the Subjunctive represents it as depending on the result; ἐάν also does the latter, but less decisively, inasmuch as the ἄν represents the condition as dependent on accidental circumstances, *if anyhow* or *perhaps*. This will suit both the passages above quoted: ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ *nisi si interpretetur*, on which the result will decide, refertur ad certam spem atque opinionem, futurum id esse (vel non esse). On the other hand, ἐάν would make the matter doubtful: *unless he perhaps*, which may be the case, *interpret*. This would be manifestly unsuitable, as the gift of interpreting did exist, and was frequently exercised, vs. 26 f. In later prose this Subjunctive became more and more frequent (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 681 and Athen. p. 146; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 185; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 53; Jacobitz, Index p. 473; Schaef. Ind. ad Aesop. p. 131), particularly in Byzantine authors (Index to Malalas and Theophanes), also in the Hellenistic writings (Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 23), and almost uniformly in the Canon. Apost. and the Basilic. (in the Sept. cf. Gen. xliii. 3, 4). In these writers a fixed distinction between εἰ with the Subj. and the same particle with the Ind., cannot be traced, (many doubt whether such a distinction existed even in Attic, Rost S. 632; cf. Mtth. 1210 f.); consequently it is uncertain whether Paul had in view the nice discrimination specified above. 277 7th ed. 264 6th ed.

b) ἐάν is followed by the Indicative (Klotz p. 468), and not only — α. by the Ind. Present (Sept. Lev. i. 14; Acta apocr. 259) according to good Codd. in Rom. xiv. 8 ἐὰν ἀποθνήσκομεν, τῷ κυρίῳ ἀποθν., a general truth: *cum morimur* (without reference to the fact that time will decide whether we die or not), 1 Thess. iii. 8 (in Gal. i. 8 the Ind. has little authority),[1] or Future, Jno. viii. 36 ἐὰν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσει, Acts viii. 31 (where, however, there is preponderant authority for the Subj.), Luke xi. 12 ἐὰν αἰτήσει ὠόν according to many uncial Codd. *cum petet*, not petierit, vi. 34; see Klotz pp. 470, 472 sq. The same (cf. Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 678, 687) occurs several times, as in Exod. viii. 21 (Lev. iv. 3), Malalas 5, p. 136; Cantacuz. 1, 6, p. 30; 1, 54, p. 273 (Basilic. I. 175; Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 23; Schaef. ind. ad Aesop. p. 131), in which passages, to be sure, forms so slightly distinguished from each other hardly permit a positive decision; — but also, β. by the Ind. Preterite, as in 1 Jno. v. 15 ἐὰν οἴδαμεν without var. cf. Ephraemius 6298 (even when the Pret. is strictly Pret. in signification, as in Job xxii. 3; Theodoret. III. 267; Malalas 4, p. 71 ἐὰν κἀκείνη ἠβούλετο, Nili ep. 3, 56 ἐὰν εἶδες, Ephraem. 5251), see Jacobs, Act. Monac. I. 147; cf. Hase, Leon. Diac. p. 143; Schaef. ad Bastii ep. crit. p. 26; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 313 and III. II. 172.[2] 311

[1] In all these passages the form might easily have arisen from a mistake in transcribing (*Fr.* Rom. III. 179); *Klotz* p. 471 sqq. has, however, adduced examples from good writers to which this would not apply.

[2] Editors of early writers have usually corrected such passages (see also *Bhdy.* Dionys.

Sometimes ἐάν and εἰ are connected in two parallel clauses; as, Acts v. 38, 39 ἐὰν ᾖ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἡ βουλὴ αὕτη ἢ τὸ ἔργον τοῦτο, καταλυθήσεται (*should it be* from men, and this the result will show), εἰ δὲ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστιν, οὐ δύνασθε καταλῦσαι αὐτό (if it *is* of God, — a case I assume), Luke xiii. 9
278 κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπόν· ... εἰ δὲ μήγε ... ἐκκόψεις si fructus *tulerit*; ... sin
7th ed. minus (si non *fert*) etc. (Plat. rep. 7, 540 d.), Gal. i. 8 f.; see Hm. Vig. 834; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. p. 143; Weber, Dem. p. 473. Cf. Her. 3, 36; Xen.
265 C. 4, 1, 15; Plat. Phaed. 93 b.; Isocr. Evag. p. 462; Lucian. dial. m. 6, 3;
6th ed. Dio Chr. 69, 621. In most cases of this nature εἰ or ἐάν repeated might be used with equal propriety, though the choice of the one conjunction or the other would obviously proceed from a different conception of the relation; see Fr. Conject. I. 25. In two mutually subordinate clauses εἰ and ἐάν are distinguished from each other in Jno. xiii. 17 εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε, μακάριοί ἐστε, ἐὰν ποιῆτε αὐτά, *if ye know ... in case ye do*, and 1 Cor. vii. 36 εἴ τις ἀσχημονεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν παρθένον αὐτοῦ νομίζει, ἐὰν ᾖ ὑπέρακμος etc. Rev. ii. 5; cf. Krü. 172.

3. *Particles of time* (Krü. 175) which 1) in narration denote a definite past event (*when*, *while*, etc.) are naturally construed with the Indicative Pret. or historical Pres.; as ὅτε Matt. vii. 28; ix. 25; Mark xi. 1; xiv. 12; Luke iv. 25; 1 Cor. xiii. 11; ὡς Matt.
312 xxviii. 9; Luke i. 23; vii. 12; Jno. iv. 40; Acts xvi. 4, etc., ὁπότε Luke vi. 3, ἡνίκα 2 Cor. iii. 15 (Lchm. and Tdf.) cf. Klotz p. 613. So likewise ἕως and ἕως οὗ[1] Matt. i. 25; ii. 9; Jno. ix. 18; Acts xxi. 26, etc.; Mtth. 1197 f. Those which 2) denote a future event (*when*, *as soon as*, *until*) likewise govern, a) if they refer to a distinctly conceived event, the Indicative (Fut.); as, Jno. iv. 21 ἔρχεται ὥρα, ὅτε ... προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί, Luke xvii. 22 ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε, xiii. 35; Jno. v. 25; xvi. 25; see Hm. Vig. 915. After ἕως the Pres. Ind. is in a few instances used for the Fut. (§ 40, 2); as, Jno. xxi. 22; 1 Tim. iv. 13 ἕως ἔρχομαι (like ἕως ἐπάνεισιν Plut. Lycurg. c. 29).[2] The Pres. Ind. after ὅτε

p. 851), sometimes without MS. authority (Arist. anim. 7, 4 p. 210 Sylb.). On the other hand, we find in Dinarch. c. Philocl. 2, even in *Bekker's* edition, ἐὰν ... εἵληφε, which, according to *Klotz's* remarks, is not to be altered.

[1] This phrase (equivalent to our *until*) is not peculiar to later prose, except when used without ἄν. Even in Her. 2, 143 we find ἕως οὗ ἀπέδεξαν, and in Xen. A. 1, 7, 6; 5, 4, 16 etc., μέχρις οὗ, so frequently in Plutarch., more fully μέχρι τούτου, ἕως οὗ Palaeph. 4, 2.

[2] In the sense of *as long as*, ἕως denoting something actual is used as naturally with the Ind. Jno. ix. 4 (xii. 35 var.; Plat. Phaed. 89 c.; Xen. C. 1, 6, 9; 7, 2, 22; Plutarch. educ. 9, 27 etc.; *Klotz*, Devar. II. 565). The same mood is used after the Imperat. in Matt. v. 25 ἴσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχύ, ἕως ὅτου εἶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ μετ' αὐτοῦ, where the Subjunctive might have been expected, as a merely possible case is indicated. This statement, however, contains a general truth, in which the case in question is represented

differs from this. That is employed in general truths; as, Jno. ix. 4 ἔρχεται νὺξ ὅτε (i.e. ἐν ᾗ) οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι, Heb. ix. 17 ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει (διαθήκη), ὅτε ζ�ῃ ὁ διαθέμενος, see Hm. as above, 915. b) If, however, the future event is only (objectively) *possible*, though viewed as under certain circumstances sure 279
to take place, the Subjunctive with a particle of time compounded 7th ed.
with ἄν (ὅταν, ἐπάν, ἡνίκα ἄν) is usually employed, see § 42. The same construction is used, when the particle of time indicates a duration or a future repetition (ὅταν, ὁσάκις ἄν), or a point of time *till* which something is to continue (ἕως ἄν) Mtth. 1199. In the latter case, however, the Subjunctive alone with ἕως, ἕως οὗ, ἄχρι, πρίν, etc. often occurs, particularly in the later authors; as, Mark 266
xiv. 32 καθίσατε ὧδε, ἕως προσεύξωμαι *until I shall have prayed*, 6th ed.
2 Pet. i. 19 καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες ... ἕως οὗ ἡμέρα διαυγάσῃ, Luke xiii. 8 ἄφες αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος, ἕως ὅτου σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν, xii. 50; xv. 4; xxi. 24; xxii. 16; xxiv. 49 (Heb. x. 13); 2 Thess. ii. 7; 1 Cor. xi. 26; xv. 25; Gal. iii. 19; Eph. iv. 13; Luke ii. 26 μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον, πρὶν ἢ ἴδῃ τὸν Χριστόν. See Plutarch. Cat. min. 59 ἄχρις οὗ τὴν ἐσχάτην τύχην τῆς πατρίδος ἐξελέγξωμεν, Caes. 7 μέχρις οὗ καταπολεμηθῇ Κατιλίνας, Plato, Eryx 392 c.; Aesch. dial. 2, 1; Lob. Phryn. p. 14 sq.; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 61 sq.; Held, 313
Plutarch. Timol. p. 369 sq.; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 568. The lucid distinction which Hm. lays down, part. ἄν p. 109 sq. (restricting it. however, immediately, p. 111) cf. Klotz, Devar. 568, however easily it finds support in the preceding passages, would vanish again as respects the N. T. on a comparison of the passages with ἕως ἄν § 42, 5. In Rev. xx. 5 οἱ λοιποὶ ... οὐκ ἔζησαν, ἕως τελεσθῇ τὰ χίλια ἔτη does not mean, till they *were completed* (narratively), but is a concise expression: they remained (and remain) dead, *till the thousand years shall be completed*. 3) The Opt. (without ἄν) occurs but once in the N. T. after a particle of time in orat. obliq. Acts xxv. 16 οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαί τινα ἄνθρωπον εἰς ἀπώλειαν, πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς κατηγόρους, τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι etc. See Klotz p. 727. In other places, where this mood might be expected, we find the Subjunctive, as in Matt. xiv. 22; Acts xxiii. 12, 14, 21; Mark ix. 9; Luke ii. 26; Rev. vi. 11; this may be in part accounted for by a blending of the orat. recta and obliqua, see below, no. 5. With

as real. On the other hand, in Luke xvii. 8 διακόνει μοι, ἕως φάγω καὶ πίω (ἄν is omitted in the better Codd. [Sin. also]) the Subjunctive is employed in reference to an uncertain limit in the future.

Matt. as above, cf. Thuc. 1, 137 *τὴν ἀσφάλειαν εἶναι μηδένα ἐκβῆναι ἐκ τῆς νεώς, μέχρι πλοῦς γένηται*, Alciphr. 3, 64; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 142; Krü. 177. Once indeed in such a case, Mark vi. 45 (which Fr. has left wholly unnoticed), the Indicative even is fully established, which is to be accounted for in a similar way; see Mey.

In Luke xiii. 35 *ἕως ἥξει, ὅτε εἴπητε* the Subjunctive is joined also with *ὅτε*, a construction that could hardly be vindicated by Attic prose (Klotz 688); but (de eventu) it is not incorrect: *quando dixeritis*. The Ind. Fut. would be more suitable in the mouth of Christ, and would correspond better to *ἥξει* (Diod. S. Exc. Vat. 103, 31 Lips.). Besides, compare as to *ὅτε* with the Subjunctive, Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 100 and in Act. Monac. I. II. 147.

4. INTERROGATIVES in indirect questions are construed,

280 a. With the *Indicative*, when the question refers to a matter of
7th ed. fact i.e. to the existence of something (*is it? is it not?*) or to the condition of something existing (*how? where? wherefore?* etc.), whether the principal clause contain a Pres. or a Pret. (Plut. Arist. 7; Xen. A. 2, 6, 4; Plat. Phil. 22 a.; rep. 1, 330 e.; conv. 194 e.; Diog. L. 2, 69; Klotz, Devar. 508); as, Mark xv. 44 *ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν, εἰ πάλαι ἀπέθανεν*, Matt. xxvi. 63; Jno. i. 40 *εἶδον ποῦ μένει*,
267 Mark v. 16 *διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς, πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ*, Acts
6th ed. xx. 18 *ἐπίστασθε . . . πῶς μεθ' ὑμῶν ἐγενόμην* (he had actually
314 been with them), 1 Thess. i. 9 *ἀπαγγέλλουσιν, ὁποίαν εἴσοδον ἔσχομεν πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, Jno. ix. 21 *πῶς νῦν βλέπει, οὐκ οἴδαμεν*, vs. 15; x. 6 *οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τίνα ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει what it was* (meant), iii. 8; vii. 27; xx. 13; Acts v. 8; xii. 18; xv. 36; xix. 2; Luke xxiii. 6; Col. iv. 6; Eph. i. 18; 1 Cor. i. 16; iii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 7; 1 Tim. iii. 15, also Jno. ix. 25 (where *ἁμαρτωλὸν εἶναι* had been asserted): whether he *is* a sinner or not. In such instances the Latin language, as is well known, taking a different view of the case employs the Subjunctive.[1] The tense of the direct question is introduced into an indirect question in Acts x. 18 *ἐπυνθάνετο, εἰ Σίμων ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται*, Heb. xi. 8; cf. Plat. apol. 21 b. *ἠπόρουν, τί ποτε λέγει*, Plutarch. Opp. II. 208 b., 220 f., 221 c., 230 f., 231 c. etc.; Polyb. 1, 60, 6; 4, 69, 3; Diog. L. 6, 42; 2, 69, and, in general, very frequently, not to say uniformly, in Greek authors.

b. With the *Subjunctive*, when something objectively possible, something which may or should take place, is to be expressed (Klotz.

[1] In Greek the Objective is expressed in the Objective mood; in Latin, the Objective, made to depend on the act of asking and inquiring, is for that reason put as a mere conception: *interrogo quid sit*. Cf. Jen. L. Z. 1812. no. 194.

Devar. 511) ; as, Matt. viii. 20 *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει, ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ where he may lay*, ubi reponat, Krü. 166; Rom. viii. 26 *τί προσευξώμθα καθὸ δεῖ, οὐκ οἴδαμεν what we should pray for* (as to the var. *προσευξόμεθα*, see Fr. in loc.), Matt. vi. 25 ; x. 19 ; Mark xiii. 11 ; Luke xii. 5, 11 ; Heb. viii. 3 ; 1 Pet. v. 8 ; cf. Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 202 and rep. I. 72; Xen. Mem. 2, 1, 21; Cyr. 1, 4, 13 ; Anab. 1, 7, 7 ; 2, 4, 19 ; Isocr. paneg. c. 41 ; Plat. rep. 368 b. Likewise after a Pret., as in Acts iv. 21 *μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες τὸ πῶς κολάσωνται αὐτούς*, Luke xix. 48 ; xxii. 2 ; Mark iii. 6 *συμβούλιον ἐποίουν . . . ὅπως αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσι*, xi. 18; xiv. 1, 40., where the Opt. might be used (Lucian. dial. d. 17, 1 ; 25, 1 etc., Kühner II. 103 ; Hm. Vig. 741), but the Subjunctive is used inasmuch as there is a reference to the direct question they put to each other: *πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωμεν* (deliberative Subjunct. cf. Thuc. 2, 52.).

In such cases the Fut. Ind. also may be used for the Subjunctive (owing to the affinity between these two forms[1]) ; as, Phil. i. 22 *τί αἱρήσομαι* 281
(without var.), *οὐ γνωρίζω what I am to choose*, Mark ix. 6, see Demosth. 7th ed.
funebr. 152 b. ; Thuc. 7, 14 ; Herod. 5, 4, 16 ; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. 151. 315
On the other hand, there is the testimony of the most distinguished Codd. [Sin. also] for *ἀρέσῃ* in 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33, 34. But in Mark iii. 2 *παρετήρουν αὐτόν, εἰ . . . θεραπεύσει* means: *whether he will* (would) *heal*, and the Fut. is necessary, as in 1 Cor. vii. 16. See Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 249.

c. The *Optative* is used to denote subjective possibility — a mere conception; hence in narration after a Pret. if a person is introduced with a question referring simply to his idea alone; as Luke xxii. 23 *ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτούς, τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν who he might* 268
be i.e. whom they should regard as, i. 29 (2 Macc. iii. 37) ; iii. 15 ; 6th ed.
viii. 9 ; xv. 26 ; xviii. 36 ; Acts xvii. 11 *ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον . . . ἀνακρίνοντες τὰς γραφάς, εἰ ἔχοι ταῦτα οὕτως whether these things were so*, xxv. 20 ; cf. Her. 1, 46 ; 3, 28, 64 ; Xen. A. 1, 8, 15 ; 2, 1, 15 ; C. 1, 4, 6, and Hm. as above, 742. See, further, Acts xvii. 27 *ἐποίησε . . . πᾶν ἔθνος . . . ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, εἰ ἄραγε ψηλαφήσειαν if haply they might feel after* etc., Acts xxvii. 12 (Thuc. ii. 77) see Mtth. 1213 ; Klotz p. 509.

Acts xxi. 33 *ἐπυνθάνετο, τίς ἂν εἴη καὶ τί ἐστι πεποιηκώς* throws especial light on the distinctive import of the moods in dependent clauses after *τίς* etc. That the prisoner had committed some offence was certain, or was assumed by the centurion as certain, and *τί ἐστι π.* inquires after the

[1] *Hm.* Eurip. Io p. 155 : ubique in conjunctivo inest futuri notatio, cujus ille cumque temporis sit. Cf. *Bmln.* 106 f.

matter of fact of the πεποιηκέναι; but *who* the prisoner might be was a point on which the centurion wished then for the first time to form an idea. Cf. Xen. Eph. 5, 12 ἐτεθαυμάκει, τίνες τε ἦσαν καὶ τί βούλοιντο, Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 107; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. 139. See also Dio Chr. 35, 429; 41, 499; Heliod. 1, 25, 46; 2, 15, 81.

In the phrase οὐδείς ἐστιν ὅς or τίς ἐστιν ὅς (of similar import), even followed by the Fut., the Indicative is always and properly used; as, Matt. x. 26 οὐδέν ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται *there is nothing covered, which shall not be revealed* (though the Romans would have said: nihil est, quod non manifestum futurum sit), xxiv. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 5; Phil. ii. 20; Acts xix. 35; Heb. xii. 7 (Judith viii. 28; Tob. xiii. 2); cf. Vig. p. 196 sq.; Bhdy. 390. The Subjunctive occurs only once in connection with the Ind.: Luke viii. 17 οὐ γάρ ἐστι κρυπτόν, ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται, οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον, ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ (BL [Sin.] have ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ). See below, § 42, 3 b. The passage adduced by Lob. Phryn. 736 from Joseph. Antt. 13, 6 is also not fully established. As to the import of this Subjunctive, see below, § 42, 3 b, p. 307.

In Jno. vii. 35 the Fut. Indic. is quite according to rule: ποῦ οὗτος μέλλει πορεύεσθαι (λέγων), ὅτι ἡμεῖς οὐχ εὑρήσομεν αὐτόν; *whither will this man go, since* (according to his statement, vs. 34) *we shall not find him?* In οὐχ
316 εὑρήσ. the words uttered by him (vs. 34) are repeated in the tense and mood of direct discourse. Acts vii. 40 (a quotation from the O. T.) is also
282 quite correct: ποίησον ἡμῖν θεούς, οἳ προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν *qui antecedant* 4th ed. (see Mtth. 1145), Phil. ii. 20; 1 Cor. ii. 16; cf. Demosth. Polycl. 711 b.; Plat. Gorg. 513 etc.; Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 2; Aristot. Nic. 9, 11.

The use of the Indic. Fut. after εἰ or εἰ ἄρα, also, is worthy of notice in cases such as Acts viii. 22 δεήθητι τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεταί σοι ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου, Mark xi. 13 ἦλθεν, εἰ ἄρα εὑρήσει τι ἐν αὐτῇ *he came, if haply he might find* etc. (in Latin, *si forte ... inveniret*). The words are here expressed in the mood which the speaker himself would employ: I will go and see, whether I shall find, etc. The Ind. Fut. after εἴπως Rom. i. 10 is of a different description, but equally well established.

In Eph. v. 15 if the sense had been: *take heed how you may (can) walk*
269 *exactly* the Subjunctive or Fut. Indicative must have been employed. 8th ed. With the Indic. Pres. the question refers to the *manner* in which the ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖν, as a Christian duty, is carried into effect; see *how* you realize the ἀκριβ. περιπατ., how you set about living accurately. Cf. Fritzsch. Opusc. p. 209. 1 Cor. iii. 10 ἕκαστος βλεπέτω πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ is not exactly similar to the preceding, inasmuch as in this passage after ἄλλος ἐποικοδομεῖ there can be no doubt that reference is made to a matter of fact.

5. The Optative in the oratio obliqua (Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 18) but rarely appears: Acts xxv. 16 πρὸς οὓς ἀπεκρίθην ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἔθος Ῥωμαίοις χαρίζεσθαί τινα ἄνθρωπον, πρὶν ἢ ὁ κατηγορούμενος

κατὰ πρόσωπον ἔχοι τοὺς κατηγόρους τόπον τε ἀπολογίας λάβοι etc.; and indeed the instances in which the words of another are indirectly quoted are rare in the N. T. When such instances occur the Indicative is commonly used; either because the intermediate clause where the Optative might have been expected is uttered in the person of the narrator (Bmln. 270) Luke viii. 47; Matt. xviii. 25; Mark ix. 9; Acts xxii. 24, or because by a mingling of two constructions the mood of the oratio recta is used for that of the oratio obliqua (which was perhaps in special accordance with colloquial usage); as, Acts xv. 5 ἐξανέστησάν τινες τῶν ... Φαρισαίων, λέγοντες ὅτι δεῖ περιτέμνειν etc., Luke xviii. 9 εἶπε καὶ πρός τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, ὅτι εἰσὶ δίκαιοι (on the contrary, Mtth. 1222), Acts xii. 18 ἦν τάραχος οὐκ ὀλίγος ... τί ἄρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐγένετο, ix. 27; xxiii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 15. Something similar occurs in Attic authors (though for the most part in lengthened sentences) Isocr. Trapez. 860; Demosth. Phorm. 586 and Polycl. 710, 711; Lys. caed. Eratosth. 19; Xen. Cyrop. 2, 4, 3; 3, 2, 27; 4, 5, 36; Hell. 2, 1, 24, and later writers Aelian. 11, 9; Diog. L. 2, 32, 74; Pausan. 6, 9, 1. See Heindorf, Plat. Soph. 317
p. 439 sq.; Mtth. 1224 sq.; Bhdy. 389.

Note 1. The consecutive particle ὥστε is usually construed with the Infin. (as the simple Infin. may be employed in a consecutive sense), cf. § 44. Yet the Finite verb is used, not only where ὥστε begins a new clause (in the sense of *quare*, *itaque*), — sometimes in the Indic. as in 283
Matt. xii. 12; xix. 6; xxiii. 31; Rom. vii. 4; xiii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 27; xiv. 22; 7th ed.
2 Cor. iv. 12; v. 16; Gal. iii. 9; iv. 7; 1 Thess. iv. 18; 1 Pet. iv. 19, etc. (Gayler de partic. negat. p. 218 sq.), and sometimes in the Conjunct. exhort. as in 1 Cor. v. 8 and the Imperat. as in 1 Cor. iii. 21; x. 12; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 1; Jas. i. 19, etc. (Soph. El. 1163; Plutarch. Them. c. 27), — but also where the clause with ὥστε forms a necessary complement to the preceding clause, as in Jno. iii. 16 οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε ... ἔδωκεν, Gal. ii. 13 (but in Acts xiv. 1 οὕτως ὥστε with Inf.). This construction is very common also in Greek authors. Thus ὥστε occurs with a Finite verb after οὕτω in Isocr. Areopag. p. 343, 354; de big. p. 838; Aegin. p. 922; Evag. 476; Lysias pro Mantith. 2, and pro mil. 17; Xen. C. 1, 4, 15; 2, 2, 10; Diog. L. 9, 68, after εἰς τοσοῦτον in Isocr. de big. p. 836; Soph. Oed. R. 533; see Gayler as above, 221 sq. Cf. Schaef. Plutarch. V. 248. The distinction at least in the better authors seems to be this: ὥστε with the Indic. presents the facts in succession purely externally as ante- 270
cedent and consequent; while with the Inf. it brings them into closer 6th ed.
connection as issuing one from the other, Klotz 772; cf. Bmln. 88.

Note 2. Ὄφελον (ὤφελον) is in the N. T. (as in later Greek) treated

quite as a particle, and construed with the Indic.; a. Of the Preterite, 1 Cor. iv. 8 ὄφελον ἐβασιλεύσατε *would that ye did reign*, Imperf. 2 Cor. xi. 1 ὄφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρόν *would that ye had patience with me for a little;* b. Of the Fut. Gal. v. 12. With this construction of ὄφελον cf. Arrian. Epictet. 2, 18, 15 ὄφελόν τις μετὰ ταύτης ἐκοιμήθη, Gregor. orat. 28 (Exod. xvi. 3; Num. xiv. 2; xx. 3). When ὄφελον had once come to be regarded as a particle, the former construction was just as correct in thought as the Imperf. or Aor. Indic. after εἴθε, Mtth. 1161; Klotz, Devar. 516 (aor. de re, de qua, quom non facta sit olim, nunc nobis gratum fore significamus, si facta esset illo tempore); the Fut., however, took the place of the Opt. In Rev. iii. 15 some Codd. have ὄφελον ψυχρὸς εἶης, others ἦς. Both readings make equally good sense.

318 § 42. THE CONJUNCTION ᾽AN WITH THE THREE MOODS.[1]

1. The particle ἄν, which in general imparts to the expression the impress of being dependent on circumstances (a fortuita quadam conditione), and accordingly conditional and fortuitous (Hm. 284 Vig. 903, 820; de partic. ἄν p. 10 sq.), *forte*, si res ita ferat, *perhaps*, 7th ed. *perchance* (should the case occur),[2] is used with one of the three moods either in an independent or a dependent clause. Yet its use in the N. T. (as in general in later Greek) is far less copious 271 and diversified than in classic (Attic) writers;[3] in particular, it is 8th ed. never found joined with a participle. In independent and simple clauses ἄν occurs in the N. T.,

[1] Compare, as to the use of this particle, the following monographs: *Poppo*, Pr. de usu partic. ἄν apud Graecos. Frcf. ad Viad. 1816. 4to. (also in *Seebode's* Miscell. crit. I. 1), *Reisig* de vi et usu ἄν particulae in his edit. of Aristoph. nub. (Lips. 1820. 8vo.) p. 97–140. I have mainly followed the theory of *Hermann*, from which the views of *Buttmann*, and still more those of *Thiersch* (Acta Monac. II. 101 sqq.), partly differ. It is most fully expounded in libb. 4 de particula ἄν, which are printed in the London edition of Stephanus's Thesaurus, as well as in *Hermann's* Opuscul. Tom. IV., and which were also published separately in Leipsic, 1831. 8vo. With *Hermann* on all the main points *Klotz* Devar. II. 99 agrees, while *Hartung* Partik. II. 218 ff. widely dissents from both. The opinion hitherto accepted respecting the import of ἄν has been completely reversed by *B. Matthiae* in his Lexic. Eurip. I. 189 sqq.; he pronounces it to be rather a corroborating and affirming particle, and gives us to understand that his view is a divina et qua nihil unquam verius exstitit descriptio. Further, compare *Bäumlein* on the Greek Moods (see above p. 281) and *Moller* in *Schneidewin*, Philolog. VI. 719 ff.

[2] Perhaps the *halt* of the South of Germany may also be compared with it.

[3] In the Sept. ἄν does not occur more seldom than in the N. T. (*Bretschneid.* Lexic. p. 22 says: multo rarius). It occurs in hypothetical clauses, where it is *required*. It is also sometimes construed with the Optative, as in Gen. xix. 8; xxxiii. 10; xliv. 8, and with the Participle in 2 Macc. i. 11; 3 Macc. iv. 1. It occurs on almost every page. As to ἄν in the Apocrypha, see *Wahl*, Clav. apocr. p. 34 sqq.

a. With the Aorist Indic. to indicate that something on a certain condition *would have* taken place (in which use a hypothetical proposition is implied in the context) Mtth. 1154 f.; Rost 606 f.; as, Luke xix. 23 *διὰ τί οὐκ ἔδωκας τὸ ἀργύριόν μου ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν; καὶ ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν ἔπραξα αὐτό*, *I should* (had the *διδόναι τὸ ἀργύρ. ἐπὶ τὴν τράπ.* occurred) *have collected it with interest.* Here the omitted protasis may be easily gathered from the question *διὰ τί ... τράπεζαν.* The same remark applies to the parallel passage in Matt. xxv. 27 *ἔδει σε βαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριόν μου τοῖς τραπεζίταις, καὶ ἐλθὼν ἐγὼ ἐκομισάμην ἂν τὸ ἐμὸν σὺν τόκῳ*, and Heb. x. 2 *ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο προσφερόμεναι*, where we may supply from vs. 1: if these sacrifices had perfected forever the offerers, — completely cleansed them from sin (Xen. A. 4, 2, 10; Thuc. 1, 11; 319
Plat. symp. 175 d.; rep. 8, 554 b.; Aristot. rhet. 2, 2, 11; Diog. L. 2, 75). Cf. Sept. Gen. xxvi. 10; Job iii. 10, 13 (Pluperf. 2 Sam. xviii. 11).

b. With the Optative, when subjective possibility is attached to condition (opinio de eo, quod ex aliqua conditione pendet, Hm. partic. *ἄν* 164 sqq.),[1] Acts xxvi. 29 *εὐξαίμην ἂν τῷ θεῷ* (*I could willingly pray God*, i.e. were I to be guided by what I feel — were I to follow the wish of my heart). This phrase (corresponding to *βουλοίμην ἄν*) occurs in Dio C. 36, 10, and *εὔξαιτ᾽ ἄν τις* in Xen. hipparch. 8, 6, *ὡς ἂν ἐγὼ εὐξαίμην* Diog. L. 2, 76. We find a similar phrase, *ἀξιώσαιμ᾽ ἄν*, in Liban. oratt. p. 200 b. In direct questions: Acts ii. 12 *λέγοντες τί ἂν θέλοι τοῦτο εἶναι; what may this perhaps mean?* (I assume it must mean something), xvii. 18 285
τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; (it being assumed that 7th ed.
his words have some meaning or other), Luke vi. 11; Gen. xxiii. 15; Deut. xxviii. 67; Job xix. 23; xxv. 4; xxix. 2; xxxi. 31; Ecclus. xxv. 3. Cf. Od. 21, 259; Xen. C. 1, 4, 12; Diog. L. 2, 5; Krü. 163.

Acts viii. 31 is equivalent to a hypothetical construction: *πῶς ἂν δυναίμην, ἐὰν μή τις ὁδηγήσῃ με;* for without a question it would run: *οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην*, cf. Xen. Apol. 6 *ἦν αἰσθάνωμαι χείρων γιγνόμενος ... πῶς ἂν ... ἐγὼ ἔτι ἂν ἡδέως βιοτεύοιμι;*

We find *ἄν* (according to most Codd. [Sin. included]) without a mood (Hm. partic. *ἄν*, p. 187) in 1 Cor. vii. 5 *μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, εἰ μή τι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου*, except perhaps in case of mutual consent.

2. After conditional clauses with *εἰ* we find *ἄν* in the apodosis

[1] *Klotz* p. 104: Adjecta ad optativum ista particula hoc dicitur: nos rem ita animo cogitare, si quando fiat, i.e. rem, si fiat, ita fieri oportere ex cogitatione quidem nostra. Cf. *Mdv.* 148 f.

with the Indicative to denote hypothetical reality (Rost 627; Mtth. 1147 f.),

a. With the Imperf. (usually), when *I would do it* is to be expressed, *α.* After an Imperf. in the antecedent clause, as in Luke vii. 39 *οὗτος εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν* etc. *were he a prophet,*
272 *he would know*, xvii. 6; Matt. xxiii. 30 (Fr.); Jno. v. 46; (viii. 19);
6th ed. viii. 42; ix. 41; xv. 19; xviii. 36; Gal. i. 10; Heb. viii. 4, 7; 1 Cor. xi. 31; Acts xviii. 14; cf. 2 Macc. iv. 47; Valckenaer ad Luc. xvii. 6. *β.* After an Aor. in the antecedent clause, as in Heb. iv. 8 *εἰ γὰρ αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς κατέπαυσεν, οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει if J. had given them rest, he would not speak* etc. (in the words pre-
320 viously quoted vs. 5) cf. in vs. 7 the Pres. *ὁρίζει*; Gal. iii. 21 (cf. Jer. xxiii. 22; Baruch iii. 13).

b. With the Aor., when *I would have done it* is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. 813), Matt. xi. 21 *εἰ ἐγένοντο ... πάλαι ἂν μετενόησαν if ... had been done, they would have repented long ago*, 1 Cor. ii. 8; Rom. ix. 29; Sept. Gen. xxx. 27; xxxi. 27, 42; xliii. 9; Judg. xiii. 23; xiv. 18; Isa. i. 9; xlviii. 18; Ps. l. 18; liv. 13; Judith xi. 2, etc. (in the conditional clause also the Aor. is used); Jno. xiv. 28 *εἰ ἠγαπᾶτέ με, ἐχάρητε ἄν if ye loved me, ye would have rejoiced*, xviii. 30; Acts xviii. 14 (the Imperf. in the conditional clause, Bar. iii. 13); Matt. xii. 7 *εἰ ἐγνώκειτε ... οὐκ ἂν κατεδικάσατε had ye known, ye would not have condemned* (the Pluperf. in the conditional clause, cf. Demosth. Pantaen. p. 624 b.; Liban. oratt. p. 117 c.); Judg. viii. 19; Job iv. 12. In this case the Plup. also is used instead of the Aor. with *ἄν*, as in 1 Jno. ii. 19 *εἰ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενήκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν mansissent* (atque adeo manerent), Jno. xi. 21 (vs. 32 Aor.) xiv. 7 (Soph. Oed. R. 984; Aeschin. Ctes. 310 a.; Demosth. cor. 324 a.; Plat. Phaed. 106 c.; Diog. L. 3, 39; Aesop. 31, 1; Lucian. fugit. 1; cf. Hm. partic. *ἄν* p. 50). See in general Hm. partic. *ἄν* I. cap. 10. The translators of the N. T. have sometimes been ignorant of this distinction of tenses, and sometimes have passed it over without notice. (The consequent clause with *ἄν* is absorbed by an interrogative clause in
286 1 Cor. xii. 19 *εἰ ἦν τὰ πάντα ἓν μέλος, ποῦ τὸ σῶμα;* Heb. vii. 11 *εἰ*
1st ed. *τελείωσις διὰ τῆς ... ἱερωσύνης ἦν, τίς ἔτι χρεία* etc. for *οὐκέτι ἂν ἦν χρεία* etc. As to *ἄν* in the interrogatory apodosis, see Wisd. xi. 26 *πῶς ἔμεινεν ἄν τι, εἰ μὴ σὺ ἠθέλησας;* On Acts viii. 31 see above.)

In Mark xiii. 20 *εἰ μὴ κύριος ἐκολόβωσε ... οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ* neither of the Aorists is put for the Imperf., but the sense is: *had not the Lord shortened those days* (in his decree), *all flesh would have perished*

(might be regarded as already perished). In Heb. xi. 15 *εἰ μὲν ἐκείνης ἐμνημόνευον ... εἶχον ἂν καιρὸν ἀνακάμψαι* the Imperf. is used in the principal clause probably because it refers to a *continued* (past) action (Mtth. 1147; Mdv. 117); in Latin also the Imperf. is used in the same way (Zumpt, Gramm. 454) *haberent: had they in mind ... they had opportunity* (during their life) *to return* (and would not therefore, at the end of their life vs. 13, have made this profession). The Aor. would have represented the *ἔχειν καιρόν* as something occurring once, and quickly passing by. Another view of the Imperf. in hypothetical clauses (Franke, Demosth. p. 59, 74) is not to the purpose.

In the consequent clause *ἄν* may be omitted also, particularly with the Imperf. (Hm. Eurip. Hec. 1087; Soph. Elect. p. 132, and partic. *ἄν* p. 70 sqq.; Bremi, exc. 4 ad Lys. p. 439 sq.; Mtth. 1152), and in later Greek was more and more frequently omitted, without designing in all cases to express the emphasis (the positiveness) originally included in this construction without *ἄν* (Kühner II. 556).[1] The several examples may be arranged as follows: 321 273 6th ed

a.) Imperf. in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. ix. 33 *εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν were he not from God, he could do nothing*, Diog. Laert. 2, 24; Lycurg. orat. 8, 4; Plat. sympos. 198 c.; Gorg. 514 c. In Jno. viii. 39 the Codd. are about equally divided as to the omission or insertion of *ἄν*; if it was used by the writer, it may have been merged by transcribers in the *νῦν* which immediately follows.

b.) Aorist in the conclusion, with the omission of *ἦν* in the condition; as, Gal. iv. 15 *εἰ δυνατὸν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἐδώκατέ μοι*, where there is not much authority for *ἄν*.

c.) Aorist in the condition, Imperf. in the conclusion; as, Jno. xv. 22 *εἰ μὴ ἦλθον ... ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον if I had not come, they would not have sin*, cf. Diog. Laert. 2, 21.

d.) Pluperf. in the conditional clause (Judg. viii. 19), Imperf. in the principal clause; as, Jno. xix. 11 *οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν οὐδεμίαν κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν thou wouldst not have ... if it had not been given thee*, Acts xxvi. 32; Rom. vii. 7 *non cognoram ... nisi diceret;* also, in the immediately preceding *τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* etc., where *ἔγνων* is to be repeated with *εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου*.

This omission of *ἄν* occurs especially with *καλὸν ἦν, ἔδει, ἐχρῆν* etc. Mdv. 119; Bmln. 140 f.; cf. Matt. xxvi. 24 *καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη* etc., see above, § 41 **a.** 2. a, p. 282. 287 7th ed

[1] Similar are such sentences in Latin as Flor. 4, 2, 19 *peractum erat* bellum sine sanguine, si Pompeium opprimere (Caesar) potuisset, Horat. Od. 2, 17, 27; Liv. 34, 29; Cic. fam. 12, 24, 2; Tac. annal. 3, 14; Sen. consol. ad Marc. I. See *Zumpt*, Gr. S. 447.

2 Cor. xi. 4 εἰ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν κηρύσσει ... καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε is rendered: *if he ... preached, ye would bear with* etc. (Cod. B alone has ἀνέχεσθε, and it has been so printed by Lchm.). Here one would certainly expect ἐκήρυσσεν, but as several words intervene the writer might easily have fallen into such an anacoluthon (*if ... preaches another Jesus ... ye would bear with it* ἀνείχ., as if he had written ἐκήρυσσεν. As, however, he had used κηρύσσει, consistency required ἀνέχεσθε), or in order not to hurt the Corinthians he designedly changes the harsh ἀνέχεσθε into the hypothetical and consequently softer ἀνείχ.; in which case, to be sure, one
322 would so much the more have expected ἄν, as the antecedent clause does not correspond with a hypothetical period (cf. also Klotz, Devar. 487 sq.). We find something similar in Diog. L. 2, 69 εἰ τοῦτο φαῦλόν ἐστιν, οὐκ ἂν ἐν ταῖς τῶν θεῶν ἑορταῖς ἐγίνετο. The passage in Demosth. Neaer. 815 a. is of another kind. (That in Rom. iv. 2 ἔχει καύχημα is not put for εἶχεν ἄν, as Rück. maintained, is apparent to one who attends to Paul's reasoning, and has been correctly shown by Köllner among recent expositors.)

274 6th ed. 3. In relative clauses after ὅς, ὅστις, ὅσος, ὅπου etc., ἄν is used,

a. With the *Indicative* when some matter of fact, something certain therefore, is spoken of, "sed cujus vel pars aliqua, vel ratio et modus dubitationem admittunt" (Hm. Vig. 819)[1]; as, Mark vi. 56 ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο *wherever he entered*, ubicunque intrabat (it might be in different places and repeatedly), ὅσοι ἂν ἥπτοντο αὐτοῦ *as many as at any time touched him;* καθότι ἄν Acts ii. 45; iv. 35, ὡς ἄν 1 Cor. xii. 2. In all these instances with a Pret., as in Gen. ii. 19; xxx. 42; Isa. lv. 11; 2 Sam. xiv. 26; Ezek. i. 20; x. 11; Esth. viii. 17; 1 Macc. xiii. 20, and also in Greek authors, as Lucian. dial. m. 9, 2, and Demon. 10; Demosth. I. Steph. p. 610 b. (Agath. 32, 12; 117, 12; 287, 13; Malal. 14, 36). On the other hand, the Present Ind. (which Klotz p. 109 sqq., in opposition to Hm., declares to be inadmissible) in the N. T. in Luke viii. 18; x. 8; Jno. v. 19 has not any great external evidence in its favor, and in Mark xi. 24 the Ind. without ἄν is to be restored, from Codd. [Sin. also], as by Lchm. In the Sept. the Present often occurs, as in Ps. ci. 3; Prov. i. 22; Lev. xxv. 16.

In Matt. xiv. 36 we find ὅσοι ἥψαντο, ἐσώθησαν, instead of the parallel in Mark vi. 56 ὅσοι ἂν ἥπτοντο, ἐσώζοντο. Both constructions are proper, according as the writer regarded the fact as in every respect definite or not. The first must be rendered: *all who* (as many as) *touched him*, of

[1] *Klotz* p. 145: In his locis quum res ipsa, quae facta esse dicatur, certa sit, pertinet illud, quod habet in se particula ἄν incerti, magis ad notionem relativam, sive pronomen, sive particula est.

the persons then surrounding him, vs. 35. Mark does not limit the nar- 288
ration to any particular place (as ὅπου ἂν εἰσεπορεύετο shows), but says 7th ed.
generally: *all who at any time touched him.* Cf. Hm. de part. ἄν p. 26.

b. With the *Subjunctive*, when the statement relates to something objectively possible, that is, regarded as only conditionally liable to occur, and then *α.* In the Aorist (most frequently), of what may perhaps occur at a future time, — where in Latin the Fut. Perf. would be used; as, Matt. x. 11 εἰς ἣν δ᾽ ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην 323
εἰσέλθητε *into whatever city ye may have entered*, in quamcunque urbem, si quam in urbem, xxi. 22 ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε *quaecunque petieritis*, xii. 32; Mark ix. 18; xiv. 9; Luke x. 35; Acts ii. 39; iii. 22, 23; viii. 19; Rom. x. 13; xvi. 2; Jas. iv. 4; 1 Jno. iv. 15; Rev. xiii. 15, etc. For examples from Greek authors, see Bornem. ad Luc. p. 65. From the Sept. cf. Gen. xxi. 6, 12; xxii. 2; xxiv. 14; xxvi. 2; xxviii. 15; xliv. 9 f.; Exod. i. 22; ix. 19; x. 28; Lev. v. 3, 15, 17; xi. 32; xx. 6, 9, 16 ff.; Num. v. 10; vi. 2; Deut. xvii. 9; Isa. xi. 11. The Fut. for the Subjunctive occurs in Deut. v. 27; Jer. xlix. 4; Judg. x. 18; xi. 24 (Malch. hist. p. 238; Cinnam. I. 6, ed. Bonn.); Mtth. 1220. *β.* In the Present, in reference to what may have already taken place or usually takes place, or is to be represented as continuous; as, Gal. v. 17 ἵνα μὴ, ἃ ἂν θέλητε, ταῦτα ποιῆτε (what you may happen to desire), Col. iii. 17 πᾶν ὅ,τι ἂν ποιῆτε, 1 Thess. ii. 7 ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάλπῃ etc., Luke ix. 57; Jno. ii. 5; v. 19; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Jas. iii. 4; Col. iii. 23. 275
See, in general, Hm. part. ἄν p. 113 sqq.; Vig. 819. In the Sept. 6th ed.
cf. Gen. vi. 17; xi. 6; 1 Sam. xiv. 7; Lev. xv. 19; Exod. xxii. 9; (much more rare than the Aor.).

In 2 Cor. viii. 12 a double construction occurs: εἰ ἡ προθυμία πρόκειται, καθὸ ἐὰν ἔχῃ, εὐπρόσδεκτος, οὐ καθὸ οὐκ ἔχει. The distinction is obvious: the positive ἔχειν in the proportion specified (καθό) may still be viewed as various, *according to what he may* (*perchance*) *have;* the negative οὐκ ἔχει is simple and definite. Cf. Lev. xxiv. 20; xxv. 16; xxvii. 12; xi. 34 πᾶν βρῶμα, ὃ ἔσθεται, εἰς ὃ ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ὕδωρ.

In Attic prose ἄν is commonly employed where relatives are construed with the Subjunctive; yet there are well-established passages in which ἄν is omitted (Rost 660 f.), and Hm. partic. ἄν p. 113 has shown when it must be omitted; cf. Schaef. Demosth. I 657; Poppo, observ. p. 143 sqq.; Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1816, April, no. 69, and ad Cyrop. p. 129, 209, but see Bmln. 212 ff. In the N. T. we find according to good Codd. [Sin. also] in Luke viii. 17 οὐ γάρ ἐστι ... ἀπόκρυφον, ὃ οὐ γνωσθῇ (al. γνωσθήσεται) καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ, which is to be rendered: which *may* not become known and come to light. The relative here points to a perfectly definite con-

ception, and not to anything whatever, quodcunque. On the other hand, one might have expected ἄν in Jas. ii. 10 ὅστις ὅλον τὸν νόμον τηρήσῃ, πταίσῃ
289 δὲ ἐν ἑνί, yet it is not necessary, inasmuch as the writer conceives the case
7th ed. as altogether definite: qui (si quis) ... custodiverit. So also in Matt. x. 33. On the other hand, in Matt. xviii. 4 Lchm. has already adopted the Fut.

4. In indirect questions ἄν is used with the Optative (after a Pret.
324 or histor. Pres.); as, Luke i. 62 ἐνένευον τῷ πατρί, τὸ τι ἂν θέλοι καλεῖσθαι αὐτόν *how he may perhaps wish him to be called* (assumed that he has a wish in the case; τί θέλοι etc. would be, *how he wished to have him called*), Acts v. 24; x. 17; xxi. 33 (see above § 41, **b.** 5), Luke vi. 11 διελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τί ἂν ποιήσειαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ *what they might do to Jesus*, quid forte faciendum videretur (pondering in doubtful mood the different possibilities), ix. 46; Jno. xiii. 24 according to the reading νεύει τούτῳ Σίμων Π. πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει (*who it might be*, whom they should perhaps regard). The better reading, however, is νεύει ... καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ τίς ἐστιν περὶ οὗ λέγει. See Klotz p. 509; cf. Esth. iii. 13.

5. After the particles of time ἄν followed by a Subjunctive (Mtth. 1194 f.) is used if an (objectively possible) action is to be expressed, —a case which can or will occur, but in regard to which there is no certainty when (how often) it will occur (Hm. partic. ἄν p. 95 sqq.).

Thus, a. ὅταν i.e. ὅτ᾽ ἄν, Matt. xv. 2 νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας, ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσι *when* (i.e. as often as) *they eat*, Jno. viii. 44; 1 Cor. iii. 4; Luke xi. 36; xvii. 10 ὅταν ποιήσητε πάντα, λέγετε *when ye shall have done*, Matt. xxi. 40 ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος ... τί ποιήσει
276 *quando venerit*. So usually with the Aorist Subjunctive for the
6th ed. Lat. Fut. exact., as in Mark viii. 38; Jno. iv. 25; xvi. 13; Rom. xi. 27; Acts xxiii. 35; 1 Cor. xv. 27; xvi. 3; 1 Jno. ii. 28, also Heb. i. 6 (as Böhme and Wahl have already pointed out), while the Subj. Present for the most part denotes a frequently repeated action not limited to any particular time (Mtth. 1195), or exhibits something in itself future simply as a fact, 1 Cor. xv. 24 (along with the Subj. Aor.). Similar to this are ἡνίκα ἄν 2 Cor. iii. 16 (*when ... it shall have turned*), ὁσάκις ἄν (*as often as*) 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26 (Pres.), ὡς ἄν *as soon as* Rom. xv. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 34; Phil. ii. 23.

b. The conjunction *until that*, as ἕως ἄν[1] in Matt. x. 11 ἐκεῖ μείνατε, ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθητε, Jas. v. 7; Luke ix. 27, ἄχρις οὗ ἄν in Rev. ii. 25 (Gen. xxiv. 14, 19; Josh. ii. 16; xx. 6, 9; Exod. xv. 16; Isa. vi. 11; xxvi. 20; xxx. 17; Tob. vii. 11, and often); cf. Soph.

[1] We find in parallel clauses in Exod. xv. 16; Jer. xxiii. 20 ἕως with the Subj. and ἕως ἄν, according to the common text.

Oed. R. 834; Xen. C. 3, 3, 18 and 46; An. 5, 1, 11; Plat. Phaed. 59 e. etc., and usually in Attic prose, Rost 617. Further cf. § 41 **b.** 3, 2) b). *Πρὶν ἄν* does not occur in the N. T.

The Fut. after ὅταν in Rev. 4, 9 ὅταν δώσουσι τὰ ζῶα δόξαν ... πεσοῦνται οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες etc., occurs according to a well-established reading for the Subjunctive *quando dederint*, as in Iliad. 20, 335 ἀλλ᾽ ἀναχωρῆσαι, ὅτε 325
κεν ξυμβλήσεαι αὐτῷ. Other Codd. have δῶσι or δώσωσι. In Luke xi. 2; 290
xiii. 28; Matt. x. 19 there is preponderant authority for the Subjunctive. 6th ed
In Rom. ii. 14 the Ind. Pres. ποιεῖ after ὅταν is very doubtful (or rather a transcriber's mistake for ποιῇ), and we should read with Lchm. and Tdf. ποιῶσιν. On the other hand, in Mark xi. 25 στήκετε is supported by good Codd., and the Ind. can be as well tolerated (since it is intended to express a specification of time only externally: *cum statis precantes*) according to Klotz, Devar. 475 sq., as it is attested by Codd. in Lycurg. 28, 3.[1] In this case the Ind. Pres. or Fut. after ὅταν sometimes occurs even in early authors, see Klotz as above, and pp. 477 sq. 690,[2] where formerly critics would not tolerate it (Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 61; Achill. Tat. 452; Mtth. 1197); in later authors (cf. e.g. Exod. i. 16; Act. Apocr. 126) it frequently occurs (Jacobs in Act. Monac. I. 146; Schaef. ind. Aesop. 149).

More singular appears, in Mark iii. 11, ὅταν with an Indicative Preter. (Imperf.) in narration: τὰ πνεύματα ... ὅταν αὐτὸν ἐθεώρει, προσέπιπτεν *whenever they saw him* (quandocunque), without var.; in Rev. viii. 1 with var. A Greek would probably have here employed (ὅτε, ὁπόταν with) the Optative, Hm. Vig. 792;[3] yet in the former passage the Ind. can be accounted for as easily as in ὅσοι ἂν ἥπτοντο, see above, 3 a. Cf. Gen. xxxviii. 9; Exod. xvii. 11; Num. xi. 9; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; Ps. cxix. 7; Thiersch p. 100 (and ἡνίκα ἄν Gen. xxx. 42; Exod. xxxiii. 8; xxxiv. 34; 277
xl. 36, ὁπότε ἐάν Tob. vii. 11, ἐάν Judg. vi. 3, where likewise a repeated 6th ed
past act is expressed), also Polyb. 4, 32, 5; 13, 7, 10 (see Schweigh. on the last passage); Aristid. Lept. § 3, 6; cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 313.[4] In the Byzantine authors, ὅταν even in the sense of *when* (in reference to an individual fact in time past) is construed with the Ind. Aor., as in Ephraem. 7119, 5386, 5732; Theoph. p. 499, 503. Cf. also Tdf. in the Verhandel. p. 142.

6. The particle of design ὅπως with ἄν denotes a purpose the accomplishment of which is still doubtful, or is regarded as depending on circumstances, *ut sit*, *si sit* (see Hm. Eurip. Bacch. 593, 1232;

[1] *Bekker* has conjectured ὦσι. Others read ὅτ᾽ ἐν, and *Blume* says distinctly: indicativus per grammaticas leges h. l. ferri nequit.

[2] The passages adduced by *Gayler* de partic. negat. p. 193 sq. may be regarded for the most part as uncertain.

[3] *Fr.* Mr. p. 801 insists on writing ὅτ᾽ ἄν, in order to show that ἄν here belongs to the verb in the sense of *always*. Cf. *Schaef.* Demosth. III. 192. Yet see *Klotz*, Dev. 688 sq.

[4] In the Sept. even ὡς ἄν occurs with the Ind. Pret. where a definite past action is spoken of, as in Gen. vi. 4; xxvii. 30 ὡς ἂν ἐξῆλθεν Ἰακώβ, etc.

partic. ἄν p. 120 sq.) *ut, si fieri possit, ut forte* (cf. Bengel, Acts iii. 19; Rom. iii. 4) Isocr. ep. 8, p. 1016; Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 21; Plat. Gorg. 481 a.; conv. 187 e.; legg. 5, 738 d. etc; Demosth. Halon 32 c.; see Stallb. ad Plat. Lach. p. 24; Krü. 167. This applies
291 well to the two N. T. passages which come under this head (Acts
7th ed. xv. 17; Rom. iii. 4 are quotations from the O. T.; and in Matt. vi. 5
326 ἄν is expunged on the authority of many Codd.): Acts iii. 19 ὅπως ἂν ἔλθωσιν καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως *ut forte* (si meae admonitioni μετανοήσατε καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε parueritis) *veniant tempora* etc., Luke ii. 35. In both the quotations from the Sept. too, particularly in Acts xv., the meaning is plain. Besides cf. Gen. xii. 13; xviii. 19; l. 20; Exod. xx. 20, 26; xxxiii. 13; Num. xv. 40; xvi. 40; xxvii. 20; Deut. viii. 2; xvii. 20; 2 Sam. xvii. 14; Ps. lix. 7; Hos. ii. 3; Jer. xlii. 7; Dan. ii. 18; 1 Macc. x. 32.

Ἄν after conjunctions and relatives never occurs with the Optative in the N. T. (but in Sept. Gen. xix. 8 — cf., however, xvi. 6 — xxxiii. 10; 2 Macc. xv. 21); but once with the Inf. 2 Cor. x. 9 ἵνα μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς *that I may not seem to terrify you;* which in oratio recta (Hm. de partic. ἄν p. 179; Krü. 311) would run: ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβοῖμι ὑμ. tamquam qui velim vos terrere.

According to the best and most numerous authorities ἐάν frequently occurs for ἄν in the N. T. text after relatives (as in the Sept. and Apocryph. see Wahl, clav. apocryph. p. 137 sq.; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 8, occasionally in the Byzantines, e.g. Malalas 5. p. 94, 144); as, Matt. v. 19 (not vii. 9); viii. 19; x. 42; xi. 27; Jno. xv. 7; Luke xvii. 33; 1 Cor. vi. 18; xvi. 3; Gal. vi. 7; Eph. vi. 8, etc., and not unfrequently in the Codd. of Greek authors, even Attic. Recent scholars (in opposition to Schneider, Xen. Mem. 3, 10, 12) uniformly write ἄν for ἐάν (see Schaef. Julian. p. V; Hm. Vig. 835; Bremi, Lys. p. 126; Boissonade, Aen. Gaz. p. 269; Stallb. Plat. Lach. p. 57; a more moderate judgment is given by Jacobs, Athen. p. 88; yet see the same author in Lection. Stob. p. 45 and on Achill. Tat. p. 831 sq., cf. also Valckenaer ad 1 Cor. vi. 18). The editors of the N. T.
278 have not yet ventured to do this; and there may really be in ἐάν for ἄν a
8th ed. peculiarity of the later (if not even of the earlier) popular language much like the Germ. *etwan* in relative clauses: *was etwan geschehen sollte* (when something occurs as it should be). Cf. Luke x. 8.

§ 43. THE IMPERATIVE.

1. The Imperative usually denotes an exhortation or command, but sometimes mere permission (permissivus) or leave (Krü.

163) [1], as in 1 Cor. vii. 15 εἰ ὁ ἄπιστος χωρίζεται, χωριζέσθω *he may* 327
depart (on the part of the Christian partner it cannot and ought not to be hindered), xiv. 38 εἴ τις ἀγνοεῖ, ἀγνοείτω (renunciation of further effective instruction). Where, however, *this* acceptation 292
is necessary, must be determined on hermeneutical, not on gram- 7th ed.
matical, grounds; and neither in Matt. viii. 32, on account of the parallel passage Luke viii. 32, nor in Jno. xiii. 27 or 1 Cor. xi. 6, can the Imperative be taken as simply permissive. On the former passage cf. BCrus.; in the latter κειράσθω like κατακαλυπτέσθω is to be understood of logical necessity (the one requires the other). On the other hand, Matt. xxvi. 45 καθεύδετε τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἀναπαύεσθε was probably uttered permissively by Jesus in the tranquil, gentle, resigned mood resulting from the prayer: *sleep on then and take your rest*. The notion of irony is incompatible with the grave earnestness of the moment. Perhaps, however, there may be something of that in Matt. xxiii. 32, and the tone of the discourse loses in force by a permissive interpretation. In Rev. xxii. 11 all is exhortation: let every one by adhering to his present course grow ripe for Christ's approaching judgment; the fate of all is, as it were, already determined.

2. When two Imperatives are connected by καὶ, the first contains sometimes the condition (supposition) under which the action denoted by the second will take place, or the second expresses an infallible result (Mtth. 1159) [2]; as, Bar. ii. 21 κλίνατε τὸν ὦμον ὑμῶν ἐργάσασθαι τῷ βασιλεῖ . . . καὶ καθίσατε ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, Epiphan. II. 368 ἔχε τοὺς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγους κατὰ ψυχήν σου καὶ χρείαν μὴ ἔχε Ἐπιφανίου. In the N. T. this explanation has been applied to Eph. iv. 26. (from Ps. iv. 5.) ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε *be angry and* 279
sin not i.e. if ye be angry ye do not sin (Rü.), Jno. vii. 52 ἐρεύνησον 6th ed.
καὶ ἴδε *search, and thou wilt see* (Kü.), cf. divide et impera. In Hebrew, constructions of this sort are certainly frequent; Ewald,

[1] According to *Moller* (*Schneidewin*, Philolog. VI. 124 ff.) the Imper. *Pres.* only should be so used. This, it is true, is found in the above passages of the N. T.; but the question in reference to the N. T. will not be regarded as thereby decided.

[2] What *Bornem.* on Luke xxiv. 39 adduces from Greek authors, is of a different nature. This mode of expression, however, cannot be considered as thereby a Hebraism; see *Gesen.* Lgb. S. 776 (where, however, some passages are quoted which remain doubtful, as Ps. xxxvii. 27, or which at any rate ought to have been separated from the others Gen. xlii. 18; Isa. viii. 9). With Eph. iv. 26 (p. 312) those passages have no analogy, otherwise the words of Paul must mean: if ye are angry, yet do not sin, or even: if ye would not sin, then be angry. It is therefore surprising that, notwithstanding this, *Zyro* (Stud. u. Krit. 1841. 3 Heft S. 685) has had recourse again to this alleged Hebraism.

krit. Gramm. 653. But in Jno. vii. the expression is more forcible than καὶ ὄψει (Lucian. indoct. 29) would have been. The result of the search is so certain, that the exhortation to search is at the same time an exhortation to see. We find the regular construction
328 in Luke x. 28. In the passage from Eph. Paul's meaning is unquestionably this: we should not let anger lead us into sin, cf. vs. 27 (see Bengel and BCrus. in loc.); vs. 31 cannot be urged against this. It is only the grammatical acceptation of the expression that is doubtful. It is either logically a single proposition ὀργιζόμενοι μὴ ἁμαρτ. divided into two grammatically, or ὀργίζεσθε must be taken permissively (cf. the similar passage Jer. x. 24). For, the assertion (Mey.) that of two closely connected Imperatives the
293 one cannot denote a permission and the other a command, is incor-
7th ed. rect; we may say with perfect propriety: Well, then, go (I give you leave), but do not stay out above an hour.

1 Tim. vi. 12 ἀγωνίζου τὸν καλὸν ἀγῶνα τῆς πίστεως, ἐπιλαβοῦ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς (where the asyndeton is not without special force) must be rendered simply: *fight the good fight of faith, lay hold of* (in and by that fight) *eternal life;* cf. Mark iv. 39, see Fr. Ἐπιλαμβ. τῆς ζωῆς is not here exhibited (though it might have been) as the result, but as the very essence, of the contest; and ἐπιλαμβ. does not signify *attain, receive.* In 1 Cor. xv. 34 ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε are obviously two exhortations, one of which (Aor.) is to be carried into effect at once, while the other (Pres.) requires continuous effort.

Constructions like Jno. ii. 19 λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν, Jas. iv. 7 ἀντίστητε τῷ διαβόλῳ, καὶ φεύξεται ἀφ' ὑμῶν (vs. 8), Eph. v. 14 (Sept.) ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός, may be resolved like two Imperatives connected by καί: *if* ye resist the devil, he will, etc. But this, grammatically, requires no remark, as the Imperative has here its ordinary import (hortatory), and the structure of these sentences can, indeed must (as incomparably more forceful), be retained in the translation also. Cf. Lucian. indoct. 29 τοὺς κουρέας τούτους ἐπίσκεψαι καὶ ὄψει, dial. d. 2, 2 εὔρυθμα βαῖνε καὶ ὄψει, Plato, Theaet. 149 b.; rep. 5, 467 c.; see Fr. Mt. as above. Even recent expositors quite erroneously take the Imperative in Jno. ii. 19; xx. 22 for the Fut., supporting their view by a reference to the Heb. in such passages as Gen. xx. 7; xlv. 18 (Glass. Philol. sacr. I. 286). Inasmuch as every command extends into future time, the Fut. tense, as a general expression of futurity, may be used for the Imperative (see no. 5); but the special form (the Imperative) cannot, in turn, be employed for the more general (Fut.). Such
280 a substitution would occasion a confusion of tongues, and the observation
6th ed. above alluded to, like so many others, is the offspring of the closet, not of attention to the phaenomena of living speech. Olshausen has correctly

opposed Tholuck (and Kühnöl) on Jno. xx. 22, and Tholuck has rectified 329
his error. In Luke xxi. 19 the Fut. is the better reading; see Meyer.

3. In the N.T. the distinction between the Aorist Imperative and Present Imperative is in general maintained (Hm. emend. rat. p. 219 and Vig. 748, cf. H. Schmid de imperativi temporib. in ling. graec. Viteb. 1833, 4to. and especially Bmln. 169 ff., and in reference to the latter, Moller in Schneidewin Philologus VI. 115 ff.). For

a. The Aorist Imperat. (cf. § 40 note 2.) denotes an action that is either transient and instantaneous (Ast, Plat. polit. p. 518; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 488), or to be undertaken but once; as, Mark i. 44 *σεαυτὸν δεῖξον τῷ ἱερεῖ*, iii. 5 *ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου*, vi. 11 *ἐκτινάξατε τὸν χοῦν*, Jno. ii. 7 *γεμίσατε τὰς ὑδρίας ὕδατος* etc., xi. 44 *λύσατε αὐτὸν* (*Λάζαρ.*) *κ. ἄφετε αὐτὸν ὑπάγειν*, 1 Cor. v. 13 *ἐξάρατε τὸν* 294
πονηρὸν ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν, Acts xxiii. 23 *ἑτοιμάσατε στρατιώτας διακο-* 7th ed.
σίους forthwith make ready to march. Besides these, see Mark ix. 22, 43; x. 21; xiii. 28; xiv. 15, 44; xv. 30; Luke xx. 24; Jno. ii. 8; iv. 35; vi. 10; xi. 39; xiii. 29; xviii. 11; xxi. 6; Acts iii. 4; vii. 33; ix. 11; xvi. 9; xxi. 39; xxii. 13; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; Eph. vi. 13, 17; Col. iii. 5; Tit. iii. 13; Philem. 17; Jas. iii. 13; iv. 8, 9; 1 Pet. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 5, 10. When something to be carried into effect at once is expressed, sometimes *νῦν* or *νυνί* is added to the Aorist Imperat.; as, Acts x. 5; xxiii. 15; 2 Cor. viii. 11. The Aorist Imperat. is used also when *δή* strengthens the injunction, as in Acts xiii. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 20 (Judith v. 3; vii. 9; Bar. iii. 4; Xen. C. 1, 3, 9; Soph. El. 524; Klotz, Devar. 395).

b. The Present Imperat. denotes an action already begun and to be continued (Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 742), or one that is permanent and frequently recurring. Hence it is commonly employed in the measured and dispassionate language of laws and moral precepts, e.g. Rom. xi. 20 *μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει* (as thou now art), xii. 20 *ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρός σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν* (constantly in such case), xiii. 3 *θέλεις μὴ φοβεῖσθαι τὴν ἐξουσίαν; τὸ ἀγαθὸν ποίει*, Jas. ii. 12 *οὕτω λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτω ποιεῖτε, ὡς διὰ νόμου ἐλευθερίας* etc., 1 Tim. iv. 7 *τοὺς βεβήλους καὶ γραώδεις μύθους παραιτοῦ*, cf. Jas. iv. 11; v. 12; 1 Tim. iv. 11, 13; v. 7, 19; vi. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 1, 8, 14; Tit. i. 13; iii. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 24; x. 14, 25; xvi. 13; Phil. ii. 12; iv. 3, 9; Eph. ii. 11; iv. 25, 26, 28; vi. 4; Jno. i. 44; xxi. 16; Mark viii. 15; ix. 7, 39; xiii. 11; xiv. 38. Hence in ordinary discourse the Present Imperat. conveys more softness and reserve of expression, and frequently denotes merely advice (Moller as above, 123 f.). 330

Accordingly the Present and the Aorist Imperat. are sometimes

used together, to denote respectively the distinctions above specified; as, Jno. ii. 16 *ἄρατε ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν, μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρός μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου*, 1 Cor. xv. 34 *ἐκνήψατε δικαίως καὶ μὴ μαρτάνετε*, Acts xii. 8 *περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου κ.*
281 *ἀκολούθει μου*, Rom. vi. 13 *μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν*
6th ed. *ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡς ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας*, Mark ii. 9; Jno. v. 8, 11; ii. 8; cf. Plato, rep. 9, 572 d. *θὲς τοίνυν πάλιν . . . νέον υἱὸν ἐν τοῖς τούτου αὖ ἤθεσι τεθραμμένον. Τίθημι. Τίθει τοίνυν καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκεῖνα περὶ αὐτὸν γιγνόμενα* (Mtth. 1128), Xen. C. 4, 5, 41; Demosth. Aphob. 2, p. 557 c. and 588 a.; Eurip. Hippol. 475 sq. and Heracl. 635.

4. Occasionally this distinction may seem to be disregarded (1 Pet. ii. 17), and the Aorist Imp. in particular appear to be employed where the Present Imp. would have been strictly required (Bhdy. 393). It must be remembered, however, that in many cases it depends on the writer whether or not he will represent the action as occurring in a point of time and momentary, or as only commencing, or likewise continuing. Neither must it be overlooked that the Aorist Imp. is in general more forcible and stringent than the Present Imp. (see no. 3), and the strengthening of discourse
295 is mainly a subjective matter; cf. Schoem. ad Isaeum p. 235.[1]
7th ed. In accordance with these principles we must judge of the following passages: *μείνατε ἐν ἐμοί* Jno. xv. 4 etc. (also *μένετε* Luke ix. 4; 1 Jno. ii. 28, *μένε* 2 Tim. iii. 14, *μενέτω* 1 Cor. vii. 24 etc.), 1 Jno. v. 21 *φυλάξατε ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων* (similarly 1 Tim. vi. 20; 2 Tim. i. 14., on the other hand 2 Pet. iii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 15), Heb. iii. 1 *κατανοήσατε τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν*, Mark xvi. 15 *πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον*, Jno. xiv. 15 *τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσατε*, Jas. v. 7 *μακροθυμήσατε ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου*, cf. Matt. xxviii. 19; 2 Tim. i. 8; ii. 3; iv. 2; 1 Pet. i. 13; ii. 2; v. 2. The Aorist Imp. will be found quite suitable in all these passages. In Rom. xv. 11 (Sept.) Jno. vii. 24 the Present Imp. and the Aorist Imp. even of the same verb are thus connected together. In many passages
331 the reading varies e.g. Acts xvi. 15; Rom. xvi. 17; as also in the Codd. of Greek authors these two forms are often interchanged,

[1] In opposition to *Schaef.* Demosth. III. 185 he remarks: tenuissimum discrimen esse apparet, ut saepenumero pro lubitu aut affectu loquentis variari oratio possit. Nam quid mirum, qui modo lenius iusserat: *σκοπεῖτε* (Demosth. Lept. 483), eundem statim cum majore quadam vi et quasi intentius flagitantem addere: *λογίσασθε*. Et plerumque, si non semper, apud pedestres quidem scriptores, in tali diversorum temporum conjunctione praes. imperativus antecedit, sequitur aoristus.

Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 99, 222, especially where they differ only in a single letter. Sometimes also one of these two Imperatives has become obsolete, — thus λάβε is constantly employed, not λάμβανε; or one of the forms predominates, as in the N. T. φέρε over ἔνεγκε. See Bmln. 172.

Respecting the Imperat. (Pres.) after μή, see § 56, 1, p. 501 sq.

The Perf. Imp. is used when an action, complete in itself, is represented as to continue in its effects, as in Mark iv. 39 in Christ's address to the troubled sea: πεφίμωσο *be* (and remain) *still!* Cf. also ἐρρώσο, ἐρρῶσθε 282
Acts xxiii. 30; xv. 29. See Hm. emend. rat. p. 218; Mtth. 1126 f.; 6.b ed.
Bmln. 174. Cf. Xen. M. 4, 2, 19; Thuc. 1, 71; Plato, Euthyd. 278 d. and rep. 8, 553 a.

5. The Imperative may also be superseded by other forms of expression:

a. By the phrase — originally elliptical — (my command is, or see) *that thou do not tarry.* We find ὅπως ἐπέξει τῷ μιαρῷ Dem. Mid. 414 c. (ὅπως with Fut. Indic. Mdv. 126), Eurip. Cycl. 595; Aristoph. nub. 823, (less frequently with the Subjunctive, Xen. C. 1, 3, 18; Lucian. dial. d. 20, 2). In the N. T. (the weakened § 44,8) ἵνα is thus used with the Subjunctive in Mark v. 23 ἵνα ἐλθὼν ἐπιθῇς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῇ, also in 2 Cor. viii. 7 (but not in 1 Cor. v. 2; 1 Tim. i. 3); and in the 3d Pers. in Eph. v 33 ἡ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα (an Imperative precedes). In the Greek poets, however, ἵνα occurs in the same connection (Soph. Oed. C. 155), and also in later prose; as, Epict. 23 ἂν πτωχὸν ὑποκρίνεσθαί σε 296
θέλῃ (ὁ διδάσκαλος), ἵνα καὶ τοῦτον εὐφυῶς ὑποκρίνῃ, Arrian. Epict. 7th ed.
4, 1, 41; and in the Byzantines even with the Ind. Pres., Malal. 13 p. 334, 16 p. 404. In Latin cf. Cic. fam. 14, 20: ibi ut sint omnia parata.

b. By a negative question with the Future (Hm. Vig. 740; Rost 678): *wilt thou not come immediately?* Aristoph. nub. 1296 οὐκ ἀποδιώξεις σεαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας; Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 22. Cf. Acts xiii. 10 οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου; 4 Macc. v. 10 οὐκ ἐξυπνώσεις; This construction, however, is for the most part more forcible than the Imperative.

c. In categorical sentences by the Future (especially in the negative form): *thou shalt not touch it*, Matt. vi. 5 οὐκ ἔσῃ ὡς ὑποκριταί, v. 48 (Lev. xi. 44). In Greek authors this mode of expression passes as milder than the Imperative, Mtth. 1122; Bhdy. 378; Sintenis, Plut. Themist. 175 sqq.; Stallb. Plato, rep. II. 295; Weber, Demosth. p. 369 sq.; (as to the Latin, see Ramsh. S. 421). 332

But in Hebrew it has established itself in the emphatic diction of legislation (Ewald, krit. Gr. 531); hence in quotations from the Old T.: Matt. v. 21, 27, 33 *οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις*, Luke iv. 12; Acts xxiii. 5; Rom. vii. 7; xiii. 9; 1 Cor. ix. 9 (Heb. xii. 20 Sept.). Only the fifth commandment *τίμα τὸν πατέρα* etc. (from Sept.) Matt. xv. 4; xix. 19; Eph. vi. 2, etc. is expressed in the Imperat. In Rom. vi. 14 the Fut. expresses simple expectation. This form of expression may be in itself either stern or mild;— depending on the tone with which it is uttered.

d. By the Infinitive: *to proceed!* This, not to mention antique and epic diction, occurs in Greek prose, and not only when a command is uttered with excitement or imperious brevity (Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 1057; Schaef. Demosth. III. 530; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 146; Bhdy. 538),[1] but also in requests, wishes, and prayers (Bremi, Dem. 230; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 388; Fr. Rom. III. 86; Mdv. 155. Compare the ancient form of salutation *χαίρειν* Acts xv. 23; Jas.
283 i. 1). Expositors have often been over-ready to discover this usage
6th ed. in the N. T. (Georgi, Hierocr. I. I. 58); altogether incorrectly in 1 Thess. iii. 11; 2 Thess. ii. 17; iii. 5, where as the accent shows Imperatives occur. In other passages the change of construction, in sentences of some length, has been overlooked: in Luke ix. 3 we find *μήτε ῥάβδον ... ἔχειν*, as if *μηδὲν αἴρειν* had been employed in the preceding part of the sentence; both constructions might have followed *εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς*, and the writer certainly thought of *ἔχειν* as an Infinitive depending on *εἶπεν*. In the parallel passage Mark vi. 8 f. we find another change of structure. Cf. Arrian. Al. 4, 20, 5 *σὺ νῦν φύλαξον τὴν ἀρχήν· εἰ δὲ ... σὺ δὲ ... παραδοῦναι*. Similarly Rom. xii. 15, see § 63. In other passages also the regular grammatical connection has been misunderstood: in Rev. x. 9 *δοῦναι* undoubtedly must be joined with *λέγων*; in Col. iv. 6 *εἰδέναι*
297 is an Inf. elucidating the preceding predicates of *λόγος*. Only in
7th ed. Phil. iii. 16 *πλὴν ... τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖν* is the Inf. most easily taken for the Imperat.; it points out here with peculiar effect the unchanging law of progress for the Christian life. Cf. Stallb. ad Plat. Gorg. 447 b.

To the imperative *ἵνα* under a. Gieseler in Rosenm. Repert. II. 145 refers the use of a *ἵνα* in John etc., as in Jno. i. 8 *οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ but he was to bear witness;* ix. 3; xiii. 18. But the
333 construction can only have this meaning when *ἵνα* signifies *in order that;*

[1] Thus in laws and moral rules in Hesiod. opp. et dd., in Theognis, in Hippocrates, in Marc. Anton. See *Gayler*, partic. negantt. p. 80 sq.

and then an ellipsis, at least of a general kind, as γέγονε τοῦτο,[1] underlies the usage, though John himself in consequence of frequent use regarded it in particular passages as nothing more than *but in order that*, cf. Fr. Mt. 840 sq. An expositor, on the contrary, if he wishes to do his duty, can and must in every case give naturally the special ellipsis from the context; as, Jno. i. 8 *he himself was not the light of the world*, but he came (ἦλθεν vs. 7) *that he might bear witness;* ix. 3 *neither hath this man sinned nor his parents, but* he was born blind *that ... might be made manifest* (cf. 1 Jno. ii. 19). In xiii. 18 there is probably an aposiopesis, which may be easily explained psychologically: *I speak not of you all, I know those whom I have chosen, but* (I have made this choice) *that ... might be fulfilled* etc.; see BCrus. (if we do not prefer to suppose that Jesus, instead of giving utterance to the painful fact in his own language, continues in the words of the Psalmist, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9). In Jno. xv. 25 ἐμίσησάν με δωρεάν in the quotation shows that μεμισήκασιν must be repeated before ἵνα. In Mark xiv. 49 the coming forth of the Jews against Jesus, in the manner described in vs. 48, is understood as predicted. Lastly, in Rev. xiv. 13 from ἀποθνήσκοντες the word ἀποθνήσκουσι may be supplied before ἵνα etc.

Note. In the N. T. text it is occasionally doubtful, whether a verbal form that answers equally for the Imperat. and (the 2d person of) the Indic. is to be taken for the former or the latter; e.g. Heb. xii. 17 ἴστε, ὅτι καὶ μετέπειτα θέλων κληρονομῆσαι τὴν εὐλογίαν ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, [xiii. 23] 1 Cor. vi. 4 βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε, τοὺς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τούτους καθίζετε, i. 26; xi. 26; Rom. xiii. 6; Eph. ii. 22; Phil. ii. 15, 22; Jno. xiv. 1; 1 Pet. i. 6; ii. 5. In all such cases the decision must depend on the context; and the question belongs not to Grammar but to Hermeneutics. 284 6th ed.

§ 44. THE INFINITIVE.[2] 298 7th ed.

1. The Infinitive, inasmuch as it expresses the idea of the verb purely and simply i.e. without reference to a subject, is least qualified of all the verbal forms to figure as a part of speech in a grammatical sentence. It is so used, a. in expressing a concise, hurried command (§ 43, 5 d.); or, b. when introduced adverbially; or, c. subjoined absolutely. Under b. comes only the phrase ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν Heb. vii. 9 (Krü. 178). To c. may be referred (Krü. 179) Phil. iv. 10 ἀνεθάλετε τὸ ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ φρονεῖν *as to your regard* 334

[1] To say that there is nothing to be supplied (as de Wette does), is not satisfactory; at any rate it must be shown how and by what means ἵνα assumes that import.

[2] *K. E. A. Schmidt* on the Infinitive. Prenzlau, 1823. 8vo.; *M. Schmidt* on the Infin. Ratibor, 1826. 8vo.; *Eichhoff* on the Infin. Crefeld, 1833. 8vo. Cf. *Mehlhorn* in the allgem. Lit. Z. 1833. Ergzbl. nr. 110.

for me, though another construction also is possible here. But an Inf. which is added to a clause as its complement (infinit. epexegeticus), generally to express *design* (Rost 687), is related to the last use, or rather coincides with it essentially, Matt. ii. 2 ἤλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ (in order) *to worship him* (after ἔρχομαι Matt. xi. 7; xx. 28; Heb. ix. 24; Rev. xxii. 12; Jno. iv. 15; Luke i. 17, and πέμπω or ἀποστέλλω Mark iii. 14; 1 Cor. i. 17; xvi. 3, and, besides, Acts v. 31; Rom. x. 7; 1 Cor. x. 7); 2 Cor. xi. 2 ἡρμοσάμην ὑμᾶς ἑνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἁγνὴν παραστῆσαι τῷ Χριστῷ, Col. i. 22; 2 Cor. ix. 5; x. 13, 16; Jno. xiii. 24 νεύει τούτῳ πυθέσθαι (cf. Diod. S. 20, 69), Rev. xvi. 9 οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν, 2 Pet. iii. 2 (1 Sam. xvi. 1) Phil. iv. 12. In other passages it denotes the result (as, in the early language, design and result were not yet distinguished, Bmln. S. 339) Col. iv. 6 ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν ... ἅλατι ἠρτυμένος ... εἰδέναι πῶς etc. *seasoned with salt, to know* (so that ye may know), Heb. v. 5; or the mode of carrying into effect, as in Acts xv. 10 τί πειράζετε τὸν θεὸν ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν μαθητῶν *imponendo jugum*, Heb. v. 5 (1 Pet. iv. 3). Lastly, in Eph. iii. 6 the Infin. clause gives the substance of the μυστήριον vs. 4; cf. also Eph. iv. 22. In Greek authors this lax use of the Inf. is carried much farther, Schaef. Soph. II. 324; Jacob, Lucian. Tox. 116; Held, Plut. Aem. P. 185 sq. The Inf. of design is particularly frequent (Soph. Oed. C. 12; Thuc. 1, 50; 4, 8; Her. 7, 208; Plut. Cim. 5; Arrian. Al. 1, 16, 10; 4, 16, 4)
285 Mtth. 1234; Krü. 186 (though the Greeks, after verbs of *going*
6th ed. or *sending*, still more frequently employ the Participle, cf. Acts viii. 27; xxiv. 11).

Such relations are more distinctly denoted sometimes by ὥστε before the Inf., as in Luke ix. 52; Matt. xxvii. 1. On the above passage in Matt.
299 where the explanation of Fr. is very far-fetched cf. Strab. 6, 324; Schaef.
5th ed. ad Bos ellips. p. 784, and Soph. Oed. Col. p. 525; Mtth. 1232. In the Byzantine writers ὥστε with the Inf. instead of the Inf. alone is peculiarly common, e.g. Malal. p. 385 ἐβουλεύσατο ὥστε ἐκβληθῆναι τὴν πενθεράν, p. 434. Cf. also Heinichen, ind. ad Euseb. III. 545. A parallel to Luke, as above, occurs in Euseb. H. E. 3, 28, 3: εἰσελθεῖν ποτε ἐν βαλανείῳ ὥστε λούσασθαι.
335 This extended use of the particle in the later language it is better to recognize in the N. T. also, than to consent to forced interpretations. Ὡς before the Inf. occurs only in Acts xx. 24 οὐδενὸς λόγον ποιοῦμαι, οὐδὲ ἔχω τὴν ψυχήν μου τιμίαν ἐμαυτῷ, ὡς τελειῶσαι τὸν δρόμον μου μετὰ χαρᾶς *in order to finish my course* etc., see Bornem. Schol. p. 174 sq.

Other forms of the Infin. epexeget. are more naturally annexed

to a proposition or a clause, and assume the form of a grammatically governed word, which they were considered to be in part by earlier grammarians:[1] a. Mark vii. 4 *πολλὰ ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν* (observanda acceperunt), Matt. xxvii. 34 *ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν ὄξος*, Eph. iii. 16 (Thuc. 2, 27; 4, 36; Lucian. asin. 43; Diog. L. 2, 51). b. 1 Cor. ix. 5 *ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν γυναῖκα περιάγειν*, ix. 4; Luke viii. 8 *ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω*, ii. 1; Acts xiv. 5; Eph. iii. 8; Heb. xi. 15 *καιρὸς ἀνακάμψαι*, iv. 1 (Plato, Tim. 38 b.; Aesch. dial. 3, 2) Mtth. 1235. In this construction a subject even may be added to the Inf., as in Rom. xiii. 11; cf. Schoem. Plut. Cleom. 187.

The Inf. is construed with Adjectives in 2 Tim. i. 12 *δυνατὸς τὴν παραθήκην μου φυλάξαι* (Thuc. 1, 139.), Heb. xi. 6; vi. 10 *οὐκ ἄδικος ὁ θεὸς ἐπιλαθέσθαι* etc., 1 Pet. iv. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 39; Mark i. 7; 2 Cor. iii. 5; Luke xv. 19; Acts xiii. 25; Heb. v. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 2; Luke xxii. 33. Cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 117; Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. 204; Weber, Demosth. 261; Bhdy. 361.

2. But the Inf. may also enter into the construction of a sentence as an integral part of it; and then its nature as a noun more or less clearly appears. In such cases it is used sometimes as the subject and sometimes as the object. It serves as subject (Mtth. 1239) in sentences such as Matt. xii. 10 *εἰ ἔξεστι τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύειν* *is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath day* (is healing etc. lawful)? xv. 26 *οὐκ ἔστι καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων*, 1 Thess. iv. 3 *τοῦτό ἐστι θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἀπέχεσθαι ... ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας* (where *ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν* precedes, which also might have been expressed by an Inf.), Acts xx. 16 *ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι* (Weber, Dem. 213), Matt. xix. 10; Eph. v. 12; Phil. i. 7; Gal. vi. 14; Jas. i. 27; Rom. xiii. 5; 1 Cor. xi. 20; Heb. vi. 6; ix. 27; 1 Pet. ii. 15. 28δ 6th ed. 336 300 7th ed.

If in such cases the Infin. itself has a subject, whether a substantive, adjective, or participle, this is usually connected grammatically with the Inf. and put in the Accusative; as, Matt. xvii. 4 *καλόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι*, xix. 24; Jno. xviii. 14; 1 Cor. xi. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 15; Acts xxv. 27; Luke ix. 33; xviii. 25. Cf. Matthiae, Eurip. Med. p. 526; Schwarz, de soloec. discip. Ch. p. 88 sq. When the subject is subjoined to the leading clause (Phil. i. 7 *δίκαιον ἐμοὶ*

[1] Likewise by those who thought that in the example adduced under b. *ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν περιάγειν*, a *τοῦ* is omitted before the Inf. (*Haitinger* in Act. Monac. III. 301): *thus* is put when the Inf. is regarded definitely as a Gen. (noun); without *τοῦ* it is the Inf. epexeget The two constructions are somewhat differently conceived, Mtth. 1235. So in Latin, Cic. Tusc. 1, 41: tempus est *abire* (cf. *Ramshorn* S. 423), in other passages *abeundi*. See in general *Stallb.* Plat. Phil. p. 213 and Euthyphr. p. 107. (As in Luke i. 9 we find *ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι*, so in Demosth. Neaer. 517 c. *λαγχάνει βουλεύειν*.)

τοῦτο φρονεῖν etc.), the adjectives construed with the Infin. stand either in the Acc. (Matt. xviii. 8 καλόν σοί ἐστιν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν ζωὴν χωλὸν ἢ κυλλόν), or in the case of the subject, according to an attraction common in Greek authors; as, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς, μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ἐπιστρέψαι, Acts xv. 25 (var.) cf. Thuc. 2, 87; Demosth. funebr. 153 a., 156 a.; Xen. Hier. 10, 2; Bhdy. 359; Krü. 180 (Zumpt 505). In Heb. ii. 10 both constructions are united: ἔπρεπεν αὐτῷ . . . ἀγαγόντα . . . τελειῶσαι cf. Mark ix. 47; Matt. xviii. 8 (Plut. Coriol. 14).

It is further to be remarked that

a. The Inf. in this case sometimes has the Article: viz. where it serves directly as a verbal noun, which takes place not only in sentences such as Rom. vii. 18 τὸ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὔ, 2 Cor. vii. 11 αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ θεὸν λυπηθῆναι πόσην κατειργάσατο ὑμῖν σπουδήν, Phil. i. 21, where the finite verb with its adjuncts forms a complete predicate; but also in the impersonal phrases καλόν, αἰσχρόν ἐστι etc. (Rost 681), if special force is intended to be given to the notion expressed by the Inf. e.g. 1 Cor. vii. 26 καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι, Gal. iv. 18 καλὸν τὸ ζηλοῦσθαι ἐν καλῷ πάντοτε, Rom. xiv. 21; 1 Cor. xi. 6. In the former case the Article could hardly be omitted; but in the latter καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ οὕτως εἶναι *it is good for a man so to be* (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 1; xiv. 35) would have been less forcible in expression.[1] Phil. i. 29 may also be reckoned in the second class; in 1 Thess. iv. 6 one such Inf. with the Article is followed by another without it (cf. Plat. Gorg. 467 d.; Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 76); but in Rom. iv. 13 the Inf. τὸ κληρονόμον εἶναι appears as a species of apposition to ἡ ἐπαγγελία. In Greek authors compare with the above, Plat. Phaed. 62 d.; Gorg. 475 b.; Xen. M. 1, 2, 1; Diod. S. 1, 93.

b. Instead of the Inf., especially when its subject is to be expressed with special force, a complete clause also is used with ἐάν, εἰ, ἵνα (according to the import); as, Mark xiv. 21 καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ, εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη, 1 Cor. vii. 8 καλὸν αὐτοῖς ἐστιν, ἐὰν μείνωσιν ὡς κἀγώ, Jno. xvi. 7 συμφέρει ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἐγὼ
301 ἀπέλθω. Respecting ἵνα, see below, no. 8. This is in part a general
7th ed. peculiarity of the (later) popular language, which prefers circumstantiality;
287 in part it is to be referred to the Hellenistic tinge of the N. T. diction.
6th ed. Yet something similar occurs in Greek authors, as in Isocr. Nicocl. p. 40, 46.
337

Likewise, when the Inf. is joined with ἐστί in the sense of *it is lawful*, or *it is possible* etc. *to* . . ., the Inf. is itself the subject; as, Heb. ix. 5 (Ast, lexic. Plat. I. 622 a.). But 1 Cor. xi. 20 may (in opposition to Wahl and

[1] A difference in *meaning* between an Inf. *with* the Art. and *without* it is certainly not to be assumed. In German, too, none such exists between *das Beten* ist segensreich and *beten* ist segensreich. Yet the Inf. becomes more forcible when used as a substantive with the Article.

Mey.) be further rendered: *when ye come together, it is* (means) *not to eat the Lord's Supper.* Τοῦτο in resumption of the Gen. abs. is not required.

3. The Inf. denotes the object (predicate) in all cases when it is requisite to complete the meaning of a verb, not only after θέλειν, δύνασθαι, τολμᾶν, ἐπιχειρεῖν, σπουδάζειν, ζητεῖν,[1] etc., but also after verbs of *believing, hoping* (I hope to come, etc.), *saying, asserting.* The regular usage need not be proved from the N. T., and therefore we have merely to remark,

a. If, in such case, the Inf. has its own subject different from that of the principal verb, such subject with all its attributives is put in the accusative (Acc. with Infin.); as, 1 Tim. ii. 8 βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας, 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Heb. vi. 11 ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδὴν etc., 2 Pet. i. 15; 1 Cor. vii. 10; Acts xiv. 19 νομίσαντες αὐτὸν τεθνάναι, 2 Cor. xi. 16 μή τίς με δόξῃ ἄφρονα εἶναι,[2] Rom. xv. 5 ὁ θεὸς δῴη ὑμῖν τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, 2 Tim. i. 18. Yet, more frequently we find a complete clause with ἵνα after verbs of *entreating, commanding*, etc. (see no. 8), with ὅτι after verbs of *saying, believing* (Matt. xx. 10; Acts xix. 26; xxi. 29; Rom. iv. 9; viii. 18; Gal. v. 10), and always in the N. T. after ἐλπίζω. If, on the other hand, the Inf. and the principal verb have one and the same subject, the qualifying words, if such there be, are subjoined in the Nominative; as, Rom. xv. 24 ἐλπίζω διαπορευόμενος θεάσασθαι ὑμᾶς, 2 Cor. x. 2 δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαῤῥῆσαι (Philostr. Apoll. 2, 23), Rom. i. 22; Phil. iv. 11; 2 Pet. iii. 14; Jude 3 (Luke i. 9?),[3] which is a kind of attraction; cf. Krüger, gramm. Untersuch. III. 328 ff. The subject itself is then not repeated; as, Jas. ii. 14; 1 Cor. vii. 36. 328
Even in this construction, however, the Accusative (with Inf.) may be used, yet only when the subject is repeated in the form of 302
a pronoun (Hm. Vig. 743), though this does not often occur; as, 7th ed.
Rom. ii. 19 πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, Phil. iii. 13 ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι, Luke xx. 20 ὑποκρινομένους, ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, Acts xxvi. 2; Rev. ii. 2, 9, perhaps also Eph. 288
iv. 22 (where, as appears to me, ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς depends on ἐδιδά- 6th ed.

[1] In opposition to *Bornem.* Schol. p. 40 see *Fr.* Rom. II. 376; cf. *Blume*, Lycurg. p 151.

[2] If the governed substantive to which the Inf. refers be in the Dative, the noun accompanying the Infin. may also be in the Dative, as in Acts xxvii. 3 ... τῷ Παύλῳ χρησάμενος ἐπέτρεψεν πρὸς τοὺς φίλους πορευθέντι ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν, unless the Dative here is a correction; see *Bornem.* On the other hand, we find in Luke i. 74 τοῦ δοῦναι ἡμῖν ἀφόβως ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας λατρεύειν αὐτῷ etc.

[3] So also in 1 Tim. i. 3 πορευόμενος belongs to παρεκάλεσα. If connected with προσμεῖναι it would necessarily, in such proximity, appear in the Accusative.

χθητε) cf. Her. 2, 2; Xen. C. 5, 1, 21 *νομίζοιμι γὰρ ἑαυτὸν ἐοικέναι* etc., 1, 4, 4 (where see Poppo); Anab. 7, 1, 30; Mem. 2, 6, 35; Diod. S. 1, 50; Exc. Vat. p. 57; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 12; see Krüger as above, S. 390. Yet in the former passages this construction was preferred probably for the sake of antithesis (see Plat. symp. c. 3, and Stallb. in loc., cf. Krüger as above, S. 386 f.) or of perspicuity: *I deem not that I myself have already* etc. For the same reason, also, ὑμᾶς, in Eph. as above, appears to be employed, since in vs. 21 another subject, Jesus, has intervened. Later writers, however, use this construction even when no antithesis is intended, cf. Heinichen, Euseb. H. E. I. 118.

b. After verbs of *saying*, (*asserting*), *believing*, the Inf. is sometimes used when the assertion etc. refers not to something that really *is*, but to something that *should be* (such verbs containing rather the notion of advice, claim, or command; see also Elmsley, Soph. Oed. T. p. 80; Mtth. 1230); as, Acts xxi. 21 *λέγων, μὴ περιτέμνειν αὐτοὺς τὰ τέκνα he said they ought not to circumcise their children* (he commanded them not to circumcise etc.) xv. 24? Tit. ii. 2; Acts xxi. 4 *τῷ Παύλῳ ἔλεγον μὴ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς Ἱεροσ. they said to Paul that he should not go up* (advised him not to go) etc. cf. Eurip. Troad. 724. In all these cases if the statement were resolved into direct address the Imperative would be used: *μὴ περιτέμνετε τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν.* Compare on this Inf. (which even recent writers still explain by supposing the omission of δεῖν, see in opposition Hm. Vig. 745) Lob. Phryn. p. 753 sqq.; Bttm. Demosth. Mid. p. 131; Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. p. 81; Jen. Lit. Zeit. 1816. No. 231; Bhdy. 371. Too many passages, however, of the N. T. have been referred to this head. Rom. xiv. 2 ὃς *μὲν πιστεύει φαγεῖν πάντα* means: *one man has confidence to eat*, and the *may* is already implied in *πιστεύειν*. In xv. 9 δοξάσαι denotes, not what the Gentiles should do, but what they actually do; see Fr. In ii. 21 f. and Eph. iv. 22 f. (see above) the verbs *to make known* and *to be instructed*, on which the Infinitives depend, inherently denote as well what is (and must be believed) as what ought to be (should be done); and, in the same way, we can say: *they preached to*
339 *them not to steal; ye have been taught to lay aside.* In Acts x. 22 *χρηματίζεσθαι* occurs, which is almost uniformly employed to denote the direction of an oracle, a divine injunction. Finally, when after verbs of *beseeching* the Inf. must be rendered by *may*, such
303 import is comprehended in the meaning of those verbs in the
7th ed. context in question, as in 2 Cor. x. 2 δέομαι τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαῤῥῆσαι

τῇ πεποιθήσει, as if, I beseech you in reference to my not being bold, that is, to see that I be not bold.[1]

c. The Article is put before the Inf. when it is the object, to make it a substantive, and thus give it greater prominence (Rost 682) Rom. xiii. 8; xiv. 13 (Luke vii. 21 var.); 1 Cor. iv. 6; 2 Cor. ii. 1; viii. 10; Phil. iv. 10; cf. above, 1 (Hm. Soph. Aj. 114); especially at the beginning of the sentence (Thuc. 2, 53; Xenoph. M. 4, 3, 1), 1 Cor. xiv. 39 τὸ λαλεῖν γλώσσαις μὴ κωλύετε (cf. Soph. Phil. 1241 ὅς σε κωλύσει τὸ δρᾶν). In Phil. ii. 6 οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, the Inf. with the Article is the immediate object of ἡγήσ., and ἁρπαγμ. is predicate, cf. Thuc. 2, 87 οὐχὶ δικαίαν ἔχει τέκμαρσιν τὸ ἐκφοβῆναι, and Bhdy. 316. 289 6th ed.

Especially deserving of attention is the use (in Luke peculiarly frequent) of the Inf. with the Acc. after ἐγένετο, as in Mark ii. 23 ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτόν *accidit, ut transiret*, Acts xvi. 16 ἐγέν. παιδίσκην τινὰ ... ἀπαντῆσαι ἡμῖν, xix. 1 ἐγέν. Παῦλον διελθόντα ... ἐλθεῖν εἰς Ἔφεσον, iv. 5; ix. 3, 32, 37, 43; xi. 26; xiv. 1; xxi. 1, 5; xxii. 6; xxvii. 44; xxviii. 8, 17; Luke iii. 21 f.; vi. 1, 6; xvi. 22 etc.[2] Here the Infinitive clause is to be considered as the (extended) subject of ἐγένετο, just as after συνέβη (see just below), and in Latin after aequum est, apertum est, etc. (Zumpt, Gr. 505): *Jesus' passing by came to pass*, etc. The construction is good Greek, though the frequent use of ἐγένετο with the Inf., instead of the historical tense of the particular verb, is primarily an imitation of the Hebrew וַיְהִי. In Greek we find a grammatical parallel in συνέβη τὴν πόλιν ... εἶναι κυριεύουσαν Diod. S. 1, 50; 3, 22, 39; Plat. legg. 1, 635 a.; Demosth. Polycl. 709 c.; Dion. H. IV. 2089, and frequently, particularly in Polybius (also 2 Macc. iii. 2), which occurs also once in Acts xxi. 35. 340 The germ of the former construction may be seen in Theogn. 639 πολλάκι ... γίγνεται εὑρεῖν ἔργ' ἀνδρῶν, with which Matt. xviii. 13 agrees most closely. It appears in its full form in Plat. Phaedr. 242 b. τὸ δαιμόνιόν τε καὶ τὸ εἰωθὸς σημεῖόν μοι γίγνεσθαι ἐγένετο; and especially in later writers, e.g. Codin. p. 138 ἐγένετο τὸν βασιλέα ἀθυμεῖν, Epiphan. Monach. ed. Dressel p. 16 ἐγένετο αὐτοὺς ἀναβῆναι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ.

The use of the Acc. with the Inf., as has been already remarked, is elsewhere in the N. T. comparatively rare. A clause with ὅτι is more

[1] In 2 Cor. ii. 7 ὥστε ... χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι the two Infinitives in the same way denote what should be, and not what actually takes place. Yet even here δεῖν is not to be supplied, but the clause with ἱκανόν extends its influence to these Infinitives: The reproach is sufficient, — that you may now, on the contrary, forgive him etc.

[2] The same construction is followed in Acts xxii. 17 ἐγένετό μοι ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ... γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει, where the Infin. might have been joined directly to μοι ὑποστ. (accidit mihi), and perhaps would have been joined to it had not the writer been led to depart from this construction by the intervention of the Gen. abs. καὶ προσευχομένου μου ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ.

304 common, quite after the manner of the later (popular) language, which
7th ed. resolves condensed constructions, and prefers the more circumstantial and perspicuous. Hence in Latin e.g. *ut* where the more ancient language employed the Acc. with the Inf.; hence, especially, the *quod* after verbs *dicendi* and *sentiendi* which in the period of declining Latin (particularly in the extra-Italian provinces) becomes more and more frequent. In German the concise construction, "He said I had come too late," is resolved in the speech of the people into "He said *that* I," etc. Moreover, it must
290 not be overlooked that after verbs *dicendi* the N. T. likes to introduce
6th ed. what is said in the oratio recta, according to the graphic idiom of Oriental tongues.

4. The Inf. rendered an unmistakable substantive by means of the Article is also employed in the oblique cases. When so used it appears in the N. T. most frequently (far more so than in Greek authors) in the Genitive. Sometimes,

a. it depends on nouns or verbs which elsewhere also govern the Genitive: 1 Cor. ix. 6 *οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι*; 1 Pet. iv. 17 *ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἄρξασθαι τὸ κρίμα* etc., Acts xiv. 9 *πίστιν ἔχει τοῦ σωθῆναι*, xx. 3 *ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν*, Luke xxiv. 25 *βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ τοῦ πιστεύειν*, Acts xxiii. 15 *ἕτοιμοι τοῦ ἀνελεῖν* (Sept. Ezek. xxi. 11; 1 Macc. v. 39); Luke i. 9 *ἔλαχε τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι* (1 Sam. xiv. 47); 2 Cor. i. 8 *ὥστε ἐξαπορηθῆναι ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῦ ζῆν*, 1 Cor. xvi. 4 *ἐὰν ᾖ ἄξιον τοῦ κἀμὲ πορεύεσθαι* if it be worthy of my going also. Cf. also 1 Cor. x. 13; 2 Cor. viii. 11; Luke xxii. 6; Phil. iii. 21; Rom. vii. 3; xv. 23; Heb. v. 12; Rev. ix. 10 (Sept. Gen. xix. 20; Ruth ii. 10; Neh. x. 29; Judith ix. 14, etc.). Sometimes the Codd. vary between the Inf. with *τοῦ* and without it, as in Rev. xiv. 15 (in other passages we find, in parallel phrases, sometimes the one and sometimes the other, Heb. v. 12; 1 Thess. iv. 9). For passages from Greek authors, see Georgi, vind. 325 sq.; Mtth. 1256. (In these, several words frequently intervene between the Article and the Inf.; but this does not occur in the N. T., owing to the simplicity of its diction. See Demosth. funebr. 153 a., 154 c.; Aristocr. 431 a.)

Under this head come also Luke i. 57 *ἐπλήσθη ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν*, ii. 21, cf. Sept. Gen. xxv. 24; xlvii. 29, as in writing Greek the
341 author regarded the Gen. as depending immediately on *χρόνος*. In Hebrew the construction is somewhat different, the Inf. with ל being used; see Ewald 621.

Sometimes, b. it is construed with entire clauses, to express *design* (see Valcken. Eurip. Hippol. 48; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 56;

Schaef. Demosth. II. 161; V. 368; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 338; Mtth. 1256 f.), where the earlier philologists supplied ἕνεκα (cf. Dem. funebr. 156 b.) or χάριν, as Luke xxiv. 29 εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι σὺν αὐτοῖς, Matt. xxiv. 45 ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν, iii. 13 παραγίνεται ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰορδάνην τοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, xiii. 3; Luke ii. 27; v. 7; xxi. 22; xxii. 31; Acts iii. 2; xxvi. 18; 1 Cor. x. 13; Heb. x. 7; Gal. iii. 10; with a negative in Acts xxi. 12 παρεκαλοῦμεν ... τοῦ μὴ ἀναβαίνειν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, Jas. v. 17; Heb. xi. 5. This construction is especially peculiar to Luke (and Paul). But in Greek prose, particularly after the time of Demosthenes, parallel instances occur; and this use of the Genitive results so surely from the primary import of the case itself (Bhdy. 174 f.), that no one should venture to find in it either an ellipsis or a Hebraism. Cf. Xen. C. 1, 6, 40 τοῦ δὲ μηδ' ἐντεῦθεν διαφεύγειν, σκοποὺς τοῦ γιγνομένου καθίστης. Plat. Gorg. 457 e. φοβοῦμαι οὖν διελέγχειν σε, μή με ὑπολάβῃς οὐ πρὸς τὸ πρᾶγμα φιλονεικοῦντα λέγειν, τοῦ καταφανὲς γενέσθαι etc. Strabo 15, 717; Demosth. Phorm. 603 b.; Isocr. Aegin. 932; Thuc. 1, 23; 2, 22; Heliod. 2, 8, 88; 1, 24, 46; Dion. H. IV. 2109; Arrian. Al. 2, 21, 13; 3, 25, 4 and 28, 12. An Inf. with, and another without τοῦ, are connected in the same principal clause in Luke ii. 22 f. If a subject is expressed in this construction it is put in the Acc. Luke v. 7.

305 7th ed.

291 6th ed.

In Phil. iii. 10 also this Inf. denotes design, where τοῦ γνῶναι is connected with vs. 8 and resumes the thought there expressed. (In the Sept. this Inf. occurs on every page, cf. Gen. i. 14; xxiv. 21; xxxviii. 9; xliii. 17; Judg. v. 16; ix. 15, 52; x. 1; xi. 12; xv. 12; xvi. 5; xix. 3; xx. 4; Ruth i. 1, 7; ii. 15; iv. 10; Neh. i. 6; 1 Sam. ix. 13, 14; xv. 27; 2 Sam. vi. 2; xix. 11; Jonah i. 3; Joel iii. 12; Judith xv. 8; 1 Macc. iii. 20, 39, 52; v. 9, 20, 48; vi. 15, 26.)

Different from this, and more closely connected with the notion of the Genitive — hence to be referred to a. — is the use of the Inf. with τοῦ after verbs signifying to *be distant from*, to *restrain or debar from*, to *prevent from*; for these verbs contain the inherent power of directly governing the Gen., and accordingly are uniformly followed by the Gen. of a noun, as Rom. xv. 22 ἐνεκοπτόμην ... τοῦ ἐλθεῖν, Luke iv. 42 καὶ κατεῖχον αὐτὸν τοῦ μὴ πορεύεσθαι (cf. Isocr. ep. 7, 1012 ἀπέχειν τοῦ τινας ἀποκτείνειν, Xen. M. 2, 1, 16; A. 3, 5, 11), with a pleonastic negative (§ 65) Acts xiv. 18 μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς (cf. παύειν τινά τινος and παύεσθαι followed by Inf. with τοῦ Diod. S. 3, 33; Phalar. ep. 35, also ἡσυχάζειν τοῦ ποιεῖν Malalas 17, p. 417), xx. 27 οὐχ ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν πᾶσαν τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. vs. 20),

342

1 Pet. iii. 10 *παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσσαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ χεῖλη αὐτοῦ τοῦ μὴ λαλῆσαι δόλον*, Luke xxiv. 16 *οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν* (Xen. Laced. 4, 6), Rom. vi. 6; Acts x. 47 (Sus. 9; 3 Esr. ii. 24; v. 69, 70; Gen. xvi. 2; Act. Thom. § 19; Protev. Jac. 2 etc.). Perhaps also *φεύγειν* and *ἐκφεύγειν τοῦ ποιῆσαι* is best explained in this way (as *φεύγειν τινός* is used), Xen. A. 1, 3, 2. Cf. Bhdy. 356; Bttm. exc. II. ad Demosth. Mid. p. 143.

In Rom. i. 24 *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ... εἰς ἀκαθαρσίαν τοῦ ἀτιμάζεσθαι τὰ σώματα αὐτῶν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* the Inf. depends directly on the noun *ἀκαθαρσ.*,
306 and there is nothing strange in the omission of *τήν* before *ἀκαθ.* (xv. 23;
7th ed. 1 Cor. ix. 6). The Gen. indicates in what this *ἀκαθ.* consisted: commisit impuritati, quae cernebatur in etc. Fr. with more detail says: virgula post *ἀκαθαρσ.* collocata ante *τοῦ* mente repete *ἀκαθαρσίαν*. The need of this I cannot perceive, as *ἀκαθαρσ.* and *ἀτιμάζ.* stand close together, and the Gen. may naturally be understood of the sphere of the *ἀκαθαρσ.* In the same way, too, in Rom. viii. 12 the Inf. *τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν* is to be understood as depending on *ὀφειλέτην*, in conformity to the regular phrase *ὀφειλέτην εἶναί τινος*; see Fr. Matt. p. 844. Finally, in Luke i. 73 *τοῦ δοῦναι* in the same way is most naturally connected with *ὅρκον*, cf. Jer. xi. 5.

It soon became usual, however, to employ this construction more loosely, not only a) After verbs involving the idea of (*entreaty*)[1]
292 *command*,[2] *determination*, and thus indirectly of *design*, Acts xv. 20
6th ed. *κρίνω ... ἐπιστεῖλαι αὐτοῖς τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι to send them the direction to abstain*, Luke iv. 10 (from the Sept.) *τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐντελεῖται περὶ σοῦ τοῦ διαφυλάξαι*, Acts xxvii. 1 (where it would be forced to connect *τοῦ ἀποπλεῖν* with the following *παρεδίδουν*), cf. Ruth ii. 9; 1 Kings i. 35; 1 Macc. i. 62; iii. 31; v. 2; ix. 69; Malal. Chron. 18, 458; Ducas p. 201, 217, 339, a.; Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 707; Vit. Epiph. p. 346; — but also, b) For epexegesis, where an Inf. with or without *ὥστε* might have been used, and the import of the Gen. is lost by blending result and design. Very fre-
343 quently so in the Sept.; (ל with the Inf. denotes both design and result; as to *εἰς* with the Inf. see afterwards). In the N. T. compare Acts vii. 19 *οὗτος κατασοφισάμενος ... ἐκάκωσε τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν τοῦ ποιεῖν ἔκθετα τὰ βρέφη* etc., *so that they cast out* (cf. Thuc. 2, 42, and Poppo in loc.), and what is still harsher iii. 12 *ὡς πεποιηκόσι τοῦ περιπατεῖν αὐτόν* (1 Kings xvi. 19). In both

[1] Cf. Malalas 14, 357 *ᾐτήσατο ἡ Αὔγουστα τὸν βασιλέα, τοῦ κατελθεῖν εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους τόπους*, 17, 422 *πυκνῶς ἔγραφε τοῖς αὐτοῖς πατρικίοις τοῦ φροντισθῆναι τὴν πόλιν*, 18, 440 *κελεύσας τοῦ δοθῆναι αὐταῖς χάριν προικὸς ἀνὰ χρυσίου λιτρῶν εἴκοσι* etc. 18, 461.

[2] A construction parallel to *κελεύειν ἵνα*.

these passages Fr.'s exposition (Matt. p. 846) is undoubtedly to be rejected; otherwise, many passages of the Sept. would either be inexplicable, or would admit of but a very forced interpretation. Cf. in particular Josh. xxii. 26 *εἴπαμεν ποιῆσαι οὕτω τοῦ οἰκοδομῆσαι*, 1 Kings xiii. 16 *οὐ μὴ δύνωμαι τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι* (1 Macc. vi. 27), xvi. 19 *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ, ὧν ἐποίησε τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν* etc., Judith xiii. 20 *ποιήσαι σοι αὐτὰ ὁ θεὸς εἰς ὕψος αἰώνιον τοῦ ἐπισκέψασθαί σε ἐν ἀγαθοῖς*, 1 Macc. vi. 59 *στήσωμεν αὐτοῖς τοῦ πορεύεσθαι τοῖς νομίμοις*, Joel ii. 21 *ἐμεγάλυνε κύριος τοῦ ποιῆσαι*.

How diversified the use of the Inf. with *τοῦ* in the Sept. is, may be seen from the following passages (which can easily be classified and which exhibit more or less distinctly the relation denoted by the Genitive): Gen. xxxi. 20; xxxiv. 17; xxxvii. 18; xxxix. 10; Exod. ii. 18; vii. 14; 307
viii. 29; ix. 17; xiv. 5; Josh. xxiii. 13; Judg. ii. 17, 21, 22; viii. 1; ix. 24, 7th ed.
37; xii. 6; xvi. 6; xviii. 9; xxi. 3, 7; 1 Sam. vii. 8; xii. 23; xiv. 34; xv. 26; 1 Kings ii. 3; iii. 11; xii. 24; xv. 21; xvi. 7, 31; Ps. xxxix. 14; Jonah i. 4; iii. 4; Mal. ii. 10; 3 Esr. i. 33; iv. 41; v. 67; Judith ii. 13; v. 4; vii. 13; Ruth i. 12, 16, 18; iii. 3; iv. 4, 7, 15. See also Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 20; Tdf. in the Verhandeling. p. 141. Cf. Acta apocr. p. 68, 85, 124, 127, etc. This Infin. is by no means unfrequent in Byzantine authors; as, Malal. 18, 452; 18, 491; cf. Index to Ducas p. 639, where p. 320 even *εἰ βούλεται τοῦ εἶναι φίλος* occurs, cf. p. 189, and p. 203 *δύναται τοῦ ἀνταποκριθῆναι*. This use of *τοῦ* must be recognized as an extravagance of declining (Hellenistic) Greek, unless forced interpretations be preferred. In Hellenistic writers this construction appears to have become the counterpart of the Inf. with ל in its manifold relations; and, as generally 293
takes place in established phrases, they no longer thought of the original 6th ed.
Genitive force.[1] Analogous to this, moreover, is the Byzantine usage of inserting *ὥστε* before the Inf. after such verbs as *βουλεύεσθαι, δοκεῖν* etc.; see Index to Malalas, Bonn ed.,[2] cf. above, no. 3.

In Rev. xii. 7 *ἐγένετο πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ* 344
τοῦ πολεμῆσαι (where the received text has the correction *ἐπολέμησαν*) a construction occurs which I am unable to explain (Lücke, too, in his Einleit. in die Offenbar. Joh. 2 Aufl. S. 454 f., was unable), unless we may consider *ὁ Μιχ. καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ* as a parenthesis — awkward to be sure — which compelled the writer to resume then the *ἐγέν. πόλεμος* in the construction *τοῦ πολεμ.* Fr.'s exposition (Matt. p. 844) appears to me artificial. It would, however, be still more inadmissible to take *τοῦ*

[1] In Aesop. 172 de Fur. we find *ἔμελλεν αὐτὸς τοῦ καταθῦσαι ταύτην*, where *Schäf.* thinking solely of the above use of the Genitive Inf. (no. 4 b.) would reject the *τοῦ*.

[2] Even native Greeks could consider this Inf. after such verbs as *δύναμαι, θέλω* etc. as a sort of Genitive, inasmuch as the action expressed by the Inf. always depends on the principal verb as a part depends on the whole.

πολεμ. for an imitation of the (later) Hebrew לְהִלָּחֵם pugnandum iis erat, as Ewald and Züllig do. For even in the Sept. that construction is in no passage rendered so strangely. If ἐγένετο τοῦ πολεμῆσαι alone were the reading, there would be a parallel in Acts x. 25 (see just below), and the construction would be tolerably explicable. Perhaps, however, the passage contains an ancient gloss, or something fell out of the text, at an early period, before τοῦ πολεμ. There is no plausibility in the proposal of Bornem. (Jen. L. Z. 1845, nr. 183) to read: ἐγένετο πολέμιος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ Μιχαήλ etc.; and with Hengstenberg boldly to supply *had war* before τοῦ πολ. would be to make John chargeable with a strange latitude in the use of words. Acts x. 25 ἐγένετο τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν τὸν Πέτρον, where τοῦ is critically established, cannot be compared to the usage mentioned by Gesen.
308 Lehrgeb. S. 786 f., for according to this it must have run: ἐγέν. ὁ Πέτρος
7th ed. τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν; it is an extravagant use of the Inf. with τοῦ[1] which in Luke certainly must be very surprising. Bornem. considers the whole clause as spurious, — but the reader is referred to B. himself for the manner in which he thinks the text should be made up. Likewise in Luke xvii. 1 ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστι τοῦ μὴ ἐλθεῖν τὰ σκάνδαλα some Codd. omit the τοῦ. If it is genuine (both Lchm. and Tdf. have retained it), the Genitive is owing probably to the notion of distance or exclusion implied in ἀνένδεκτ., cf. above, no. 4 b. The view of Mey. is different.

5. The Dative of the Inf. denotes the *cause*, according to the
294 inherent import of that case, see § 31, 6 c. (Mtth. 1258; Schaef.
6th ed. Demosth. II. 163; Stallb. Plat. Tim. p. 203), 2 Cor. ii. 13 οὐκ ἔσχηκα ἄνεσιν τῷ πνεύματί μου τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν Τίτον *because I found not* etc.; cf. Xen. C. 4, 5, 9; Demosth. pac. 21 c., funebr. 156 b., ep. 4 p. 119 b.; Achill. Tat. 5, 24; Lucian. abdic. 5; Diog. L. 10, 27; Liban. ep. 8; Athen. 9, 375; Joseph. antt. 14, 10, 1; Simplic. in Epict. enchir. c. 38, p. 385; Schweigh. Agath. 5, 16. This Inf. is understood by some as denoting *design* in 1 Thess. iii. 3 τῷ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι ἐν
345 ταῖς θλίψεσι *in order that no one be shaken* etc., as it were 'for the not being shaken' (Schott. in loc.), a thought which is subordinate to the εἰς τὸ στηρίξαι, and therefore was not expressed by a repetition of this form. No such Dat. Infin., however, occurs in Greek; and we must read with good Codd. [Sin. included] τὸ μηδένα σαίνεσθαι, which has now been received into the text. See above, 1. Remark.

6. The Infinitive in an oblique case is often joined to a *preposition*, particularly in narration, and almost more frequently in the N. T. than in Greek authors. The Article is then never omitted (Hm.

[1] Cf. Acta apocr. p. 66 ὡς ἐγένετο τοῦ τελέσαι αὐτοὺς διδάσκοντας etc. Under this head would come also Acts ii. 1 if the reading were καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις τοῦ συμπληροῦσθαι.

Vig. 702; Krü. 94),[1] though several words may be inserted between the Article and the Inf. (Acts viii. 11; Heb. xi. 3; 1 Pet. iv. 2);[2] as, Matt. xiii. 25 *ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους while men slept*, Gal. iv. 18; Luke i. 8; Acts viii. 6 (Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 5; Hiero 1, 6); iii. 26 *εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν* etc. *by turning away, in that* he turns away (Heb. iii. 12); Phil. i. 23 *ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι desire towards departing* (to depart), Jas. i. 19 *βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι slow to speak*, 1 Cor. x. 6 *εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι* 309
ὑμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν to the end that ye be not etc., ix. 18; 2 Cor. 7th ed.
iv. 4; vii. 3; Matt. xxvi. 2; Luke iv. 29; Acts vii. 19 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; An. 7, 8, 20) Rom. iv. 18 (see Philippi), 1 Thess. ii. 16; 2 Cor. viii. 6 *εἰς τὸ παρακαλέσαι ἡμᾶς Τίτον so that we besought Titus* (lit., unto the beseeching etc.),[3] Rom. vii. 5; Heb. xi. 3; Heb. ii. 15 *διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν* (through) *all their life-time*, Phil. i. 7 *διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς because I have you* etc.,[4] Acts viii. 11; xviii. 2; Heb. vii. 23; x. 2; Luke ii. 4; Mark v. 4 (Xen. C. 1, 4, 5; Mem. 2, 1, 15; Aristot. rhet. 2, 13; Pol. 2, 5, 2); Jas. iv. 15 *ἀντὶ τοῦ λέγειν ὑμᾶς instead of your saying* (Xen. Apol. 8; Plat. 295
rep. 1, 343 a.); Matt. vi. 8 *πρὸ τοῦ ὑμᾶς αἰτῆσαι before your* 6th ed.
asking, Luke ii. 21; xxii. 15; Acts xxiii. 15 (Zeph. ii. 2; Plato, Crit. 48 d.); Matt. vi. 1 *πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι αὐτοῖς in order to be seen of them*, 2 Cor. iii. 13; 1 Thess. ii. 9; Luke xviii. 1 *ἔλεγεν παραβολὴν πρὸς τὸ δεῖν πάντοτε προσεύχεσθαι in reference to* etc.; Matt. xxvi. 32 *μετὰ τὸ ἐγερθῆναί με after my resurrection*, when I 346
shall have been raised, Luke xii. 5; Mark i. 14; Acts vii. 4; xv. 13 (Herod. 2, 9, 6; 3, 5, 10); 2 Cor. vii. 12 *εἵνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν* (Demosth. fun. 516 a. b.; Plato, Sis. 390 b.; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 39. Also inscript. Rosett. 11).

Paul with peculiar frequency expresses purpose by the Infinitive with *εἰς* or *πρός*, while in such cases the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews prefers a derivative noun; see Schulz, Hebräerbr. S. 146 ff. But cf. also 1 Cor. vii. 35.

[1] On the other hand, cf. Theodoret. III. 424 *ἀπὸ κυβεύειν τὸ ὄνομα*, IV. 851 *παρὰ συγκλώθεσθαι*, Psalt. Sal. 4, 9. Similar constructions sometimes occur in Greek prose (*Bhdy.* 354; *Kühner* II. 352), but it is uncertain.

[2] Yet not so many, and not entire clauses even, as frequently in Greek authors (Xen. Oec. 13, 6; Cyr. 4, 5, 9; 7, 5, 42 etc.). The adjuncts, too, are uniformly put *after* the Inf. An Inf. with *ἄχρι* or *μέχρι* never occurs; with *ἕνεκα* only once.

[3] The rendering of the Inf. with *εἰς* by *so that* is unobjectionable, as *εἰς* is elsewhere employed to express alike either aim or result; cf. Eurip. Bacch. 1161.

[4] Against the other exposition, according to which *ὑμᾶς* is taken as the subject, see *van Hengel* in loc. Even where the subject is placed *after* the Infinitive the proper construction is always to be determined by the context, e.g. Simplic. enchir. 13 p. 90 *διὰ τὸ πολεμίους μιμεῖσθαι τοὺς συγγυμναστάς*. Cf. Jno. i. 49.

If in this construction of the Inf. with a prep. a subject be annexed, it is put in the Acc. even when it is one and the same with the subject of the principal clause; as, Heb. vii. 24 ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ μένειν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ... ἔχει, Luke ii. 4. Predicates also stand then in the Acc.; as, Luke xi. 8 δώσει αὐτῷ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτοῦ φίλον; but cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 3 διὰ τὸ φιλομαθὴς εἶναι ... αὐτὸς ἀνηρώτα, Mtth. 1284. Yet the attraction, which properly accounts for the Nominative, is also in other circumstances omitted in Greek authors.

The Inf. (without the Article) after πρίν or πρὶν ἤ (Reitz, Lucian. IV. 501 ed. Lehm.), may be considered as Inf. nominascens; e.g. Jno. iv. 49 κατάβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν τὸ παιδίον μου is equivalent to πρὸ τοῦ ἀποθ. etc. The Inf. with this particle is employed not only in connection with a Fut.
310 or Imperf. in reference to a still impending fact (Mtth. 1200) Matt. xxvi. 34
7th ed. (Acts ii. 20); but also in reference to past events (Xen. C. 3, 3, 60; An. 1, 4, 13; Herod. 1, 10, 15) in connection with Preterites, Matt. i. 18; Acts vii. 2; Jno. viii. 58. As to πρὶν ἤ cf. Her. 2, 2; 4, 167.

7. The well-known distinction between the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor., as well as between the Inf. Aor. and Inf. Fut. (Hm. Vig. p. 773),[1] is for the most part very clearly observed in the N. T. The Inf. Aorist is employed,

a. In *narration* after a Preterite on which it depends (in accordance with that parity of tenses carefully observed in Greek, see Schaef. Demosth. III. 432; Stallb. Phileb. p. 86 and Phaed. p. 32); as, Mark ii. 4 μὴ δυνάμενοι προσεγγίσαι αὐτῷ ... ἀπεστέγασαν, xii.
296 12 ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, v. 3 οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο αὐτὸν δῆσαι, Luke
6th ed. xviii. 13 οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπᾶραι, Jno.
347 vi. 21; vii. 44; Matt. i. 19; viii. 29; xiv. 23; xviii. 23; xxiii. 37; xxvi. 40; xxvii. 34; Mark vi. 19, 48; Luke vi. 48; x. 24; xv. 28; xix. 27; Acts x. 10; xvii. 3; xxv. 7; Col. i. 27; Gal. iv. 20; Philem. 14; Jude 3. This is quite regular, and requires no proof from Greek authors. Mdv. 188. (Sometimes, however, we find the Inf. Pres., as in Jno. xvi. 19; Acts xix. 33; Luke vi. 19, and in parallel passages the Inf. Pres. is used in Matt. xxiii. 37, while in Luke xiii. 34 the Inf. Aor.) Likewise the Inf. Aor. is uniformly connected with the Imp. Aor.; as, Matt. viii. 22 ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς, xiv. 28; Mark vii. 27.

[1] *Stallb.* Plat. Euthyd. p. 140: Aoristus (Infin.) quia nullam facit significationem perpetuitatis et continuationis, prouti vel initium vel progressus vel finis actionis verbo expressae spectatur, ita solet usurpari, ut dicatur vel de eo, quod statim et e vestigio fit ideoque etiam certo futurum est, vel de re semel tantum eveniente, quae diuturnitatis et perpetuitatis cogitationem aut non fert aut certe non requirit, vel denique de re brevi et uno veluti temporis ictu peracta.

b. After any tense, when an action (rapidly) passing, completed at once, or instantly to begin, is to be expressed (Hm. Vig. as above); as, Mark xiv. 31 *ἐάν με δέῃ συναποθανεῖν σοι*, xv. 31 *ἑαυτὸν οὐ δύναται σῶσαι*, Matt. xix. 3 *εἰ ἔξεστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα*, 1 Cor. xv. 53 *δεῖ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν*. Cf. Jno. iii. 4; v. 10; ix. 27; xii. 21; Acts iv. 16; Rev. ii. 21; 2 Cor. x. 12; xii. 4; 1 Thess. ii. 8; Eph. iii. 18. Under this head comes also Jno. v. 44 (*πιστεύειν* signifies *to exercise faith, to become a believer*).

c. In particular, after verbs of *hoping*, *promising*, *commanding*, *wishing*, and many others, the Greeks frequently employ the Inf. Aor. (Lob. Phryn. p. 751 sq.; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 153; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 50 sq.; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 525, 719; Weber, Demosth. 343, especially Schlosser, vindic. N. T. locor. adv. Marcland. Hamb. 1742, 4to. p. 20 sqq.), viz. where the action is to be designated merely as brought to pass ("ab omni temporis definiti conditione libera et immunis," Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 140; Weber, Dem. as above);[1] whereas the Inf. Pres. has reference to 311
the continuance of the action, or represents it as just now occurring, 7th ed.
and the Inf. Fut. (after verbs of *hoping*, *promising*) represents it as not to occur till some future time of indefinite remoteness (Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 215 sq.; cf. Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 138; Pflugk, Eur. Heracl. p. 54 sq.). In the N. T. *ἐλπίζω* is uniformly followed by the Inf. Aor. [since only in Acts xxvi. 7 is the Infin. Future found as the solitary variant of Cod. B], and none of the examples will occasion any difficulty, especially as it often depends upon the writer how he will view the action; as, Luke vi. 34 *παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν*, Phil. ii. 23 *τοῦτον ἐλπίζω πέμψαι, ὡς ἂν ἀπίδω* etc. vs. 19; 2 Jno. 12 *ἐλπίζω γενέσθαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς*, 3 Jno. 14; Acts xxvi. 7; Rom. xv. 24; 1 Tim. iii. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 7; 2 Cor. x. 15.[2] Likewise *ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι* is usually construed with the Inf. Aor.; as, 297
Mark xiv. 11 *ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτῷ δοῦναι*, Acts iii. 18; vii. 5; similarly 6th ed. 348
ὄμνυμι, Acts ii. 30 *ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσαι ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου*; on the other hand, see Inf. Fut. in

[1] It is less probable that the Inf. Aor. is intended to designate the action as rapidly passing (*Hm.* Soph. Aj. p. 160; *Krüg.* Dion. H. p. 101, and others); this element hardly comes to view in the case of a hope or a command.

[2] For an Inf. Perf. after *ἐλπίζω* see 2 Cor. v. 11 *ἐλπίζω καὶ ἐν ταῖς συνειδήσεσιν ὑμῶν πεφανερῶσθαι that I have been made manifest*, where *ἐλπίζω* is not exactly equivalent to *νομίζω*, but indicates an impression still requiring confirmation; but the Inf. Perf. after the preceding *πεφανερώμεθα* needs no explanation. Cf. Iliad. 15, 110 *ἤδη νῦν ἔλπομ' Ἀρηΐ γε πῆμα τετύχθαι*, appropriately quoted by *Mey.* Further, cf. below (no. 7, end).

Heb. iii. 18; Weber, Demosth. 330. After κελεύειν the Inf. Aor. is more frequent than the Inf. Pres., the latter being used for the most part in reference to a continued action; as, Acts xvi. 22 ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίζειν, xxiii. 35 ἐκέλευσε αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ πραιτωρίῳ φυλάσσεσθαι, xxiii. 3; xxv. 21 etc. Παρακαλεῖν has the Inf. Aor. in Rom. xii. 1; xv. 30; 2 Cor. ii. 8; Eph. iv. 1, etc.; but the Inf. Pres. in Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 10; 1 Tim. ii. 1.

This explains also the use of the Inf. Aor. after ἕτοιμος and ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ἔχειν (in reference to the future), as in 2 Cor. x. 6; xii. 14; 1 Pet. i. 5; Acts xxi. 13, which is more frequent than the Inf. Pres. The former is on the whole rare in Greek authors; yet cf. Dion. H. III. 1536 (Joseph. antt. 12, 4, 2; 6, 9, 2). In the N. T. πρίν also is uniformly used with the Inf. Aor.; and when πρίν refers to the future, the Inf. Aor. has the meaning of the Fut. exact. See Hm. Eurip. Med. p. 343.

Whether in the N. T. the Inf. Aor. ever has the force of a Preterite, except in the use considered in 7 a., is questionable. In Rom. xv. 9 τὰ ἔθνη ὑπὲρ ἐλέους δοξάσαι τὸν θεόν this might seem at first to be the case, as the Inf. depends on λέγω vs. 8 (Mdv. S. 187) and corresponds to
312 a Perfect γεγενῆσθαι, while Paul would certainly have expressed continuous
7th ed. glorifying by a Present. Probably, however, he merely wished to express the act of glorifying without reference to time at all. Likewise in 2 Cor. vi. 1 it is not necessary to take δέξασθαι as a Preterite, as even Mey. does [yet not in the later editions], though the connection which Fr. Rom. III. 241 suggests between vi. 1 and v. 20 is somewhat far-fetched. Probably in later Greek the Inf. Perf. quite superseded the Inf. Aor. in such cases, as being more expressive; see p. 334 below, no. 7, end.

The Inf. Present is generally employed to express an action just taking place, or (in itself or its results) continuing, or frequently repeated; as, Jno. ix. 4 ἐμὲ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με, vii. 17 ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, xvi. 12 οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι, iii. 30; Acts xvi. 21; xix. 33; Gal. vi. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 25; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Tit. i. 11; Phil. i. 12. Hence it is used in general maxims; as, Luke xvi. 13 οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις
349 δουλεύειν, Mark ii. 19; Acts v. 29; Matt. xii. 2, 10; Jas. iii. 10, etc. Verbs of *believing*, are construed with the Inf. Pres. to express something which already exists or at least has already commenced (Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 91); as in 1 Cor. vii. 36; Phil. i. 17 (16). See Ast, Plat. legg. p. 204. As to κελεύειν with the Inf. Pres. see above.

If this distinction is not always rigorously observed where it might be expected, this may be explained by the circumstance that in many cases it depends entirely on the writer whether he

will represent an action as continuing, or as transient and occupy- 298
ing only a point of the past (cf. Luke xix. 5; Matt. xxii. 17); and 6th ed.
by the fact that some writers are negligent in such matters. Hence in parallel passages we sometimes find the Inf. Aor. and Inf. Pres. employed in the same relation; as, Matt. xxiv. 24 cf. Mark xiii. 22; Matt. xiii. 3 cf. Luke viii. 5, also Jude 3. The like occurs even in the better Greek authors; as, Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 1 *εἴ τι τοῦ βασιλέως δέοιντο, τοὺς παῖδας ἐκέλευον τοῦ Κύρου δεῖσθαι διαπράξασθαι σφίσι· ὁ δὲ Κῦρος, εἰ δέοιντο αὐτοῦ οἱ παῖδες, περὶ παντὸς ἐποιεῖτο διαπράττεσθαι*, 6, 1, 45 *ἦν ἐμὲ ἐάσῃς πέμψαι*, 46 *ἐκέλευσε πέμπειν*, 2, 4, 10 *οὓς ἄν τις βούληται ἀγαθοὺς συνεργοὺς ποιεῖσθαι . . . οὓς δὲ δὴ τῶν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἔργων προήσασθαί τις βούλοιτο συνεργοὺς προθύμους* (cf. Poppo in loc.), Demosth. Timocr. 466 a. *μὴ ἐξεῖναι λῦσαι μηδένα (νόμον), ἐὰν μὴ ἐν νομοθέταις, τότε δ' ἐξεῖναι τῷ βουλομένῳ . . . λύειν*. Cf. also Arrian. Al. 5, 2, 6. We find a perceptible distinction, however, between the Inf. Pres. and the Inf. Aor. in parallel clauses e.g. in Xen. C. 5, 1, 2. 3; Mem. 1, 1, 14; Her. 6, 177 etc., see Mtth. 944; Weber, Demosth. 195, 492. In the N. T. cf. Matt. xiv. 22 *ἠνάγκασε τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον* (quickly passing action) *καὶ προάγειν* (continued) *αὐτόν* etc. Luke xiv. 30; Phil. i. 21. See in general Maetzner, 313
Antiphon p. 153 sq. 7th ed.

It appears, on the whole, that where the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor. may be used indiscriminately, the latter is the more common (as being the less definite), particularly after *ἔχω possum* (Hm. Eur. suppl. p. 12 praef.), *δύναμαι, δυνατός εἰμι, θέλω*, etc. In the Codd. of Greek authors the Inf. Pres. and Inf. Aor. are not unfrequently interchanged, see Xen. C. 2, 2, 13; Arrian. Al. 4, 6, 1; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 904, 941, etc. So likewise in the N. T., cf. Jno. x. 21; Acts xvi. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 35; 1 Thess. ii. 12.

The preceding remarks will also account for the use of the Inf. Aor. after hypothetical clauses, as in Jno. xxi. 25 *ἅτινα, ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἕν, οὐδὲ αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι non comprehensurum esse*, where some unneces- 350
sarily would insert *ἄν*; cf. Isocr. Trapez. 862; Demosth. Timoth. 702 a.; Thuc. 7, 28; Plat. Protag. 316 c. (in some of which cases, it is true, *εἰ* with the Opt. precedes). The expression is more confident (without *ἄν*), see Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 43; cf. Lösner, obs. p. 162 sq. The Inf. Fut. (that is, also without *ἄν*, cf. Hm. partic. *ἄν* p. 187) is not singular in such constructions, Isocr. ep. 3 p. 984.

As to the construction of *μέλλειν*, in particular, with the Inf., that verb in Greek authors is most frequently used with the Inf. Fut. (cf. also Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 206 sq.), more rarely with the Inf. Pres. (cf. Dion. H. IV. 2226, 8; Arrian. Al. 1, 20, 13; 5, 21, 1, and Krüger, Dion. p. 498).

This, however, is not very surprising as the notion of futurity is already implied in *μέλλειν*, and the construction is analogous to that of *ἐλπίζειν*. It is still more rarely used with the Inf. Aor. (Plat. apol. 30 b.; Isocr. Callim. p. 908; Thuc. 5, 98; Paus. 8, 28, 3; Ael. 3, 27). This last construction, indeed, some ancient grammarians (e.g. Phrynich. p. 336) pronounce to be un-Greek, or rather un-Attic; but they have been thoroughly
299 confuted with a considerable number of undoubted examples by Böckh,
6th ed. Pind. Olymp. 8, 32; Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 117; Bremi, Lys. p. 745 ff., cf. also Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 149. In the N. T. we most frequently find after *μέλλειν*, a. the Inf. Pres. (in the Gospels always); only in a few passages, b. the Inf. Aor., and that mostly in reference to transient actions, as in Rev. iii. 2 *μέλλει ἀποθανεῖν*, iii. 16 *μ. ἐμέσαι*, xii. 4 *μ. τεκεῖν*, Gal. iii. 23 *τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι*, cf. Rom. viii. 18 (but 1 Pet. v. 1); c. more rarely the Inf. Fut., viz. in Acts xi. 28 *λιμὸν μέγαν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι*, xxiv. 15 *ἀνάστασιν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι νεκρῶν*, xxvii. 10 (xxiv. 25).

The Perfect Inf. is frequently employed, especially in narration, to denote a past event in its relation to present time; as, Acts xvi. 27 *ἔμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν, νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέναι τοὺς δεσμίους had fled*, and accordingly were away, xxvii. 13 *δόξαντες τῆς προθέσεως κεκρατηκέναι they had* (already) *obtained their purpose* (and were thus in possession of the advantages), viii. 11; xxvii. 9; xxvi. 32; Heb. xi. 3; Rom. iv. 1; xv. 8, 19; Mark v. 4; Jno.
314 xii. 18, 29; 2 Tim. ii. 18 (1 Pet. iv. 3) 2 Pet. ii. 21. In several
7th ed. of these passages, after verbs of *saying*, *supposing*, *thinking*, a Greek author would perhaps have considered the Inf. Aorist as sufficient, Mdv. 187. On. 2 Cor. v. 11 see p. 331 note [2]; as to 1 Tim. vi. 17 see § 40, 4 a. p. 273.

8. That the N. T. writers sometimes (see below, p. 338 sq.) use *ἵνα* where, according to the syntax of (the written) Greek prose, simply the Inf. (Pres. or Aor., not the Perf.) should be expected, was
351 correctly admitted by the earlier biblical philologists, but has been resolutely denied by Fr. (exc. I. ad Matt., yet see Rom. III. 230), whom Mey., and almost nobody else hitherto, has followed.[1] In such phrases as the following, Matt. iv. 3 *εἰπέ, ἵνα οἱ λίθοι οὗτοι ἄρτοι γένωνται*, xvi. 20 *διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν* etc., and particularly Mark v. 10 *παρεκάλει αὐτὸν πολλά, ἵνα μὴ αὐτοὺς ἀποστείλῃ* etc., the original meaning of *ἵνα* might indeed be retained, and the phrases rendered: *speak* (a word of power), *to the*

[1] On the other hand, *Tittmann*, Synon. II. 46 sqq., *Wahl* (also in the Clav. apocryph. p. 272), and *Bretschneider* agree with me in the view for which I contend. Besides, compare *Robinson*, a Greek and English Lexicon of the N. T. (New York, 1850. 8vo.) p. 352 sq.

end that these stones become bread; he charged his disciples, to the end that they should tell no man; he besought him much, to the end that he would not send them away. Still, it would be strange, in the first place, that in so many passages, instead of the object of the entreaty or of the command, which was to be expected, the design should be stated, which in such connections usually merges itself in the object. Again, the possibility of the foregoing interpretation shows merely how close the affinity is in such a case between the design and the object, and how easily therefore ἵνα might have come to be employed to denote the latter. It is accordingly much simpler to believe that the later language, in accordance with its genius, resolved the more condensed construction with the Inf. into a sep- 200
arate clause and to some extent weakened the import of ἵνα.[1] just 6th ed.
as the Romans employed their *ut* after *impero*, *persuadeo*, *rogo*, inasmuch as the object of the *command*, *request* etc. is always something to be accomplished, and therefore the purpose of the person commanding or beseeching.[2] Traces of this use of ἵνα already occur 315
in writers of the κοινή. That is to say, in these writers, 7th ed.

a. Ἵνα after verbs of *desiring* and *beseeching* already begins to pass over into a *that* of the objective clause[3]; as in Dion. H. I. 215 δεήσεσθαι τῆς θυγατρὸς τῆς σῆς ἔμελλον, ἵ ν α με πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀγάγοι, II. 352
666 sq. κραυγὴ ... ἐγένετο καὶ δεήσεις .. ἵ ν α μένῃ etc., Charit. 3, 1 παρεκάλει Καλλιῤῥόην ἵ ν α αὐτῷ προσέλθῃ, Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 27 (see Schaef. Melet. p. 121). In the Hellenistic writers this use is quite common; as, 2 Macc. ii. 8: Sir xxxvii. 15; xxxviii. 14; 3 Esr. iv. 46; Joseph. antt. 12, 3, 2; 14, 9, 4; Ignat. Philad. p. 379; Cod. pseudepigr. I. 543, 671, 673, 730; II. 705; Act. Thom. 10, 24, 26; Acta apocr. p. 36.[4] As to ἵνα after verbs of *commanding*

[1] *Weakened*, because originally ἵνα was employed only where a direct design was to be expressed: *I come, in order to help thee.* Even *worthy to be kept* the earlier writers express not by ἵνα (Matt. viii. 8; Jno. i. 27; vi. 7, etc.), but by the Inf., perhaps with ὥστε (Mtth. 1238). But it does not follow that the weakened ἵνα yet coincides altogether with ὥστε. It appears rather to be for the most part still recognizable as an extension of *eo consilio ut*. Hence there is no inconsistency in maintaining the above rule on one page, and on the next denying that ἵνα is to be considered as equivalent to ὥστε (see § 53, 10).

[2] Those who vehemently combat this view should at least confess that the use of ἵνα in the cases mentioned is not in accordance with the (older) prose diction of the Greeks. This is the least requirement of grammatical fairness.

[3] A solitary instance in the earlier authors (Demosth. cor. 335 b.) is ἀξιοῦν ἵνα.

[4] In the Acts Luke has never employed this construction, but after ἐρωτᾶν and παρακαλεῖν always uses the Inf., see viii. 31; xi. 23; xvi. 39; xix. 31; xxvii. 33. In the Gospel also he has in v. 3 the Inf. with ἐρωτᾶν, which occurs also in Jno. iv. 40; 1 Thess. v. 12. Matthew usually connects παρακαλεῖν with the direct words of the individual entreating.

and *directing*,[1] see Hm. Orph. p. 814; cf. Leo Philos (in epigrammat. gr. libb. 7, Frcf. 1600, fol. p. 3) εἰπὲ κασιγνήτῃ κρατεροὺς ἵνα θῆρας ἐγείρῃ, Malal. 3 p. 64; Basilic. I. 147. κελεύειν and θεσπίζειν ἵνα (3 Esr. vi. 31; Malal. 10 p. 264), ἐπιτρέπειν ἵνα Malal. 10 p. 264, διδάσκειν ἵνα Acta Petri et Pauli 7.[2] Accordingly in the N. T. also we may cease to insist on the strict force of ἵνα, and may render it in the following passages simply by *that*, just as in Latin praecipe, rogavit, imploravit *ut* etc.: Luke x. 40 εἰπὸν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται (iv. 3; Mark iii. 9; Jno. xi. 57; xiii. 34; xv. 17), 2 Cor. xii. 8 τὸν κύριον παρεκάλεσα ἵνα ἀποστῇ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ (Mark v. 18; viii. 22; Luke viii. 31; 1 Cor. i. 10; xvi. 12; 2 Cor. ix. 5), Mark
301 vii. 26 ἠρώτα αὐτὸν ἵνα τὸ δαιμ. ἐκβάλῃ (Jno. iv. 47; xvii. 15; Luke
6th ed. vii. 36), Luke ix. 40 ἐδεήθην τῶν μαθητῶν σου ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν (xxii. 32), Phil. i. 9 προσεύχομαι ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ὑμῶν ... περισσεύῃ,

b. Moreover, θέλειν ἵνα also simply means: *will (wish) that*,[3] cf.
316 Arrian. Ep. 1, 18, 14; Macar. hom. 32, 11; Cod. pseudepigr. I. 704;
7th ed. Philo, Apocr. I. 546, 684, 706; Tdf. in the Verhandel. p. 141. If Matt. vii. 12 ὅσα ἂν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν means, *wish with the design that they do*, one cannot understand why θέλειν ἵνα did not become a common construction in the language, since θέλειν may
353 be always so taken. And ought Mark vi. 25 θέλω ἵνα μοι δῷς τὴν κεφαλὴν Ἰωάννου to be rendered: *I will in order that thou give me?* What is the proper object of choice here? Is it not the obtaining of John's head? Why then that circumlocution? And how affected it would be to render Mark ix. 30 οὐκ ἤθελεν ἵνα τις γνῷ, *he would not, in order that any one should know!* That nobody should know was precisely his object of choice. Cf. also Acts xxvii. 42 βουλὴ ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσι, Jno. ix. 22 συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα ... ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται, xii. 10

[1] In the N. T. κελεύειν is never construed with ἵνα.

[2] An analogous construction is the Inf. with τοῦ after verbs of *beseeching, exhorting, commanding*, as in Malal. 17, 422 πυκνῶς ἔγραφε τοῖς αὐτοῖς πατρικίοις τοῦ φροντισθῆναι τὴν πόλιν, 18, 440 κελεύσας τοῦ δοθῆναι αὐταῖς χάριν προικὸς ἀνὰ χρυσίου λιτρῶν εἴκοσι etc., 461 ᾔτησε πᾶς ὁ δῆμος τοῦ ἀχθῆναι πάνδημον, p. 172. Index to Ducas in the Bonn ed. p. 639 sq.

[3] Hence the modern Greek circumlocution for the Inf.: θέλω νὰ γράφω or γράψω, for γράφειν, γράψαι. In general how far modern Greek goes in its application of the particle νά — which occurs even in the Byzantine writers, e.g. Cananus (cf. also *Boissonade*, Anecd. IV. 367) — a few passages from the Orthodox Confession will show: p. 20 (ed. *Normann*) πρέπει νὰ πιστεύωμεν (p. 24, 30), p. 36 λέγεται νὰ κατοικᾷ, p. 43 ἐφοβεῖτο νὰ δουλεύῃ (scrupled cf. Matt. i. 20), p. 113 ἠμπορεῖ νὰ δεχθῇ, p. 211 θέλει, ἐπιθυμᾷ νὰ ἀποκτήσῃ, p. 235 ἔχουσι χρέος νὰ νουθετοῦσι, p. 244 εἴμεσθαν χρεωφειλέται νὰ ὑπογένωμεν. In the above passages, therefore, the modern Greek translator has almost always retained the ἵνα in the form νά.

(Sir. xliv. 18), and, as an isolated instance of the commencement of such construction among the Greeks, Teles in Stob. serm. 95 p. 524, 40 *ἵνα Ζεὺς γένηται ἐπιθυμήσει.* Under this head comes also *ποιεῖν ἵνα* in Jno. xi. 37 ; Col. iv. 16 ; Rev. iii. 9 (analogous to *ποιεῖν τοῦ* with Inf., see above, no. 4) and *διδόναι ἵνα* in Mark x. 37 ; see Krebs in loc. Lastly,

c. In Matt. x. 25 *ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ*, does the interpretation *satis sit discipulo non superare magistrum, ut ei possit par esse redditus* seem easy and agreeable? Cf. Jno. i. 27 ; vi. 7 ; Matt. viii. 8 (Inf. Matt. iii. 11 ; 1 Cor. xv. 9 ; Luke xv. 19, etc.). In John iv. 34 *ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν, ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με* does the use of *ἵνα* seem to be completely justified by the translation *meus victus hoc continetur studio, ut Dei satisfaciam voluntati?* In that case *σπουδάζειν ἵνα* must have been the ordinary and most natural construction. That in Jno. xv. 8 the clause with *ἵνα* cannot express the design with which God glorifies himself (Mey.), has already been shown by Lücke ; cf. also xvii. 3. To resolve also Matt. xviii. 6 *συμφέρει αὐτῷ, ἵνα κρεμασθῇ μύλος ὀνικὸς . . . καὶ καταποντισθῇ* etc. into *συμ. αὐτῷ κρεμασθῆναι μύλον ὀν. . . . ἵνα καταποντ.* etc. (by an attraction), would, I greatly fear, be generally thought very forced. And Meyer's opinion is too manifestly a shift. See also Luke xvii. 2 ; 302
Jno. xi. 50 ; xvi. 7 ; 1 Cor. iv. 2, 3 ; Phil. ii. 2 ; likewise Luke 6th ed.
i. 43 *πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου* etc.,[1] on which passage Hm. partic. *ἄν* p. 135 remarks : fuit haec labantis linguae quaedam incuria, ut pro infinitivo ista constructione uteretur. In fact, in all these phrases every unprejudiced scholar must perceive that the clause with *ἵνα* contains what, in classical Greek, would have been expressed by the simple Inf. (Mtth. 1235), just as in Latin (especially of the silver age) *aequum est ut, mos est ut, expedit ut* was employed, where the mere Inf. (as subject) would have been sufficient, see Zumpt S. 522. Sometimes the construction 317
with *ἵνα* and that with the Inf. are found connected, as in 1 Cor. 7th ed. 354
ix. 15 *καλὸν γάρ μοι μᾶλλον ἀποθανεῖν, ἢ τὸ καύχημά μου ἵνα τις κενώσῃ*, where it is easy to perceive what led the apostle to alter the construction ; yet in this passage the *ἵνα* is not fully established. Thus the traces of the ancient function of the particle of design still exhibited in the examples adduced under a., and even under b. also, have entirely disappeared in the passages last illus-

[1] Analogous is Arrian. Epictet. 1, 10, 8 *πρῶτόν ἐστιν, ἵνα ἐγὼ κοιμηθῶ.* Cf. besides, Acta apocr. p. 8, 15, 29.

trated. And so we see how modern Greek, gradually extending the usage, forms *every* Infin. by means of *νά*. How far popular Greek had already declined in the second century, appears from many parts of Phryn., and in particular p. 15 sq. Lobeck's ed.

What Wyttenbach, Plutarch. Mor. I. 409 Lips. (p. 517 Oxon.), has adduced from Greek authors to prove the alleged lax use of ἵνα for ὥστε, is not all to the point. In πείθειν ἵνα (Plut. apophth. 183 a.) the verb is not regarded as supplemented by the clause with ἵνα (by persuasion to effect *that*), but as independent: to speak persuasively *in order that*. Τί μοι τοιοῦτο συνέγνως, ἵνα τοιαύταις με κολακεύσῃς ἡδοναῖς (Plut. fort. Alex. p. 333 a.) means: *what hast thou discerned in me of the kind in order to flatter?* that is, concisely: what could lead you to flatter me? In Adv. Colot. p. 1115 a. (240 ed. Tauchn.) ποῦ τῆς ἀοικήτου τὸ βιβλίον ἔγραφεν, ἵνα ... μὴ τοῖς ἐκείνου συντάγμασιν ἐντύχῃς, what was properly but result is attributed to the writer as *design;* so we too say: In what desert then did he write his book, to keep you from obtaining it? In Liban. decl. 17 p 472 οὐδείς ἐστιν οἰκέτης πονηρός, ἵνα κριθῇ τῆς Μακεδόνων δουλείας ἄξιος no slave is bad, in order to be judged worthy, — ἵνα is not used for ὡς after an intensive (so bad as to be), but denotes the design which the slaves' πονηρία might have occasioned see § 53, 10, p. 461. These passages are not exactly parallel to the above constructions from the N. T., but they exhibit the gradual transition to them. The phrase ὅρα ὅπως does not come under this head, and the ὅπως also after verbs of *beseeching, commanding*, etc. (Matt. viii. 34; ix. 38; Luke vii. 3; x. 2; xi. 37; Acts xxv. 3; Philem. 6, etc.), which is not uncommon in Greek authors (Schaef. Demosth. III. 416; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 439; Holwerda, emendatt. Flav. p. 96 sq.),
303 is usually otherwise explained, Mtth. 1231; Rost S. 648. Yet see Tittmann, Synon. II. 59.
6th ed.

Further, John's use of ἵνα (cf. Lücke I. 603, II. 632 f., 667 f.) deserves special attention; in particular where ἵνα refers complementally to a demonstrative pronoun. Two cases are to be distinguished:

355 a. 1 Jno. iii. 11 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν *that we should love*, vs. 23, cf. vi. 40. Here the telic force of ἵνα is clearly discernible (in the manner stated above p. 334 sq.), as in iv. 34 ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντος *that I may do* (strive to do), vi. 29. In these passages nobody will consider ἵνα as equivalent to ὅτι. On the other hand,

b. Jno. xv. 8 ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν φέρητε is certainly equivalent to the construction with the Inf. (ἐν τῷ καρπὸν πολὺν
318 φέρειν ὑμᾶς). The same applies to xvii. 3 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωή, ἵνα
7th ed. γινώσκωσιν etc.,[1] xv. 13; 1 Jno. iv. 17; 3 Jno. 4; like Luke i. 43 πόθεν μοι τοῦτο, ἵνα ἔλθῃ for τὸ ἐλθεῖν τὴν μ. see p. 337. To these may be added the

[1] *Schweigh.* is wrong in adducing in his Lexic. Epictet. p. 356 the passage from Arrian. Epict. 2, 1, 1 as an instance of *this* construction.

phrase χρείαν ἔχειν ἵνα Jno. ii. 25 ; xvi. 30 ; 1 Jno. ii. 27 (Ev. apocr. p. 111) as well as Jno. xviii. 39. On the other hand, viii. 56 ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ is not *he rejoiced in order to see ;* yet still less is it *that* (ὅτι) *he saw*, but *that he should see ;* — a thought which, although ἵνα implies the idea of purpose (design), could hardly have been expressed in Greek by means of ἵνα alone. In Jno. xi. 15 ἵνα is simply a particle of design.

Finally, the construction ἔρχεται or ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα, ἵνα δοξασθῇ xii. 23 ; xiii. 1 ; xvi. 2, 32 means : *the time is come in order to*, that is, the time appointed for the purpose, that etc. True, in a Greek author in the same sense the Inf. ἐλήλ. ἡ ὥρα (τοῦ) δοξασθῆναι, perhaps ὥστε δοξ., would have been employed.[1] Cf. Ev. apocr. p. 127.

As to Rom. ix. 6 οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, where a clause with ὅτι seems to be used as a periphrasis for the Inf., see § 64, I. 6.

Note 1. It sometimes appears as if the Inf. Act. were used for the Inf. Pass. (d'Orville, Charit. p. 526) e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 9 περὶ τῆς φιλαδελφίας οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε γράφειν ὑμῖν (Heb. v. 12), but v. 1 οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφεσθαι ; cf. also Heb. vi. 6. Both constructions, however, are equally proper, (Active, *ye have no need to write to you*, that is, that I (one) write to you ; as if : ye have no need of one's writing etc.). In such connections the Inf. Act. is perhaps even more frequent in classical Greek ; see Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. p. 151 Lips. ; Jacobs, Philostr. Imagg. 620, also as respects χρὴ and δεῖ in particular, Weber, Demosth. 306. Cf. especially Theodoret. II. 1528 ; IV. 566.

Note 2. Ὅτι occurs with the Inf. in Acts xxvii. 10 θεωρῶ ὅτι μετὰ πολλῆς ζημίας οὐ μόνον τ. φορτίου καὶ τ. πλοίου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν (cf. Xen. Hell. 2, 2, 2 εἰδώς, ὅτι, ὁσῳ ἂν πλείους συλλεγῶσιν 304
ἐς τὸ ἄστυ, θᾶττον τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἔνδειαν ἔσεσθαι, Cyr. 1, 6, 18 ; 2, 4, 15 ; 6th ed.
An. 3, 1, 9 ; Plato, Phaed. 63 c. ; Thuc. 4, 37), which is a blending of two 356
constructions (Hm. Vig. 500) : μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν and ὅτι μέλλει ἔσεσθαι ὁ πλοῦς. So especially after verbs *sentiendi* and *dicendi*, Schaef. ad Bast. ep. crit. p. 36 ; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 479 ; Wyttenb. Plutarch. Moral. I. 54 ; Boissonade, Philostr. 284 and Aen. Gaz. p. 230 ; Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 172 sq. This so frequently occurs in the best authors (even in short sentences, Arrian. Al. 6, 26, 10), that it almost ceased to be felt by the Greeks as an anacoluthon, and to the ὅτι may be attributed merely a vis monstrandi, as when it introduces the oratio directa, cf. Klotz, Devar. 319
p. 692. (Similarly ἵνα with the Inf. 3 Esr. vi. 31.) 7th ed.

Note 3. A trace of the Hebrew Inf. Absol. presents itself from the Sept. in Matt. xv. 4 θανάτῳ τελευτάτω (Exod. xix. 12 ; Num. xxvi. 65), and in the diction of the N. T. itself in Rev. ii. 23 ἀποκτενῶ ἐν θανάτῳ (cf מוֹת יָמוּת), and Luke xxii. 15 ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα etc. So frequently in the

[1] The Subjunctive excludes the possibility of taking ἵνα in these cases for *where* (*Hoogev.* partic. I. 525 sq.) ; as, otherwise, it would be necessary to regard the Subj. Aor. as exactly equivalent to the Fut. (*Lob.* Phryn. 723). Yet see *Tittmann*, Synon. II. 49 sq.

Sept. the Inf. Absol. is expressed by the Ablative of a nomen conjugat. annexed to a verb, in a manner not altogether foreign to the Greek idiom (§ 54, 3), as in Gen. xl. 15 ; xliii. 2 ; l. 24 ; Exod. iii. 16 ; xi. 1 ; xviii. 18 ; xxi. 20 ; xxii. 16 ; xxiii. 24 ; Lev. xix. 20 ; Num. xxii. 30 ; Deut. xxiv. 15 ; Zeph. i. 2 ; Ruth ii. 11 ; Judith vi. 4 (test. patr. p. 634). See, in general, Thiersch p. 169 sq. How in still other passages the Sept. expresses the Inf. Absol., see below, § 45, 8, p. 354.

Note 4. There is nothing singular in a concurrence of several Infinitives in a single sentence, one depending on another, somewhat as in 2 Pet. i. 15 *σπουδάσω ἑκάστοτε ἔχειν ὑμᾶς ... τὴν τούτων μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι*. In Greek authors three Infinitives not unfrequently occur thus in immediate succession ; Weber, Demosth. 351.

§ 45. THE PARTICIPLE.

1. The verbal character of the Participle appears, partly in its directly governing the same case as its verb (Luke ix. 16 *λαβὼν τοὺς ἄρτους*, 1 Cor. xv. 57 *τῷ διδόντι ἡμῖν τὸ νῖκος*, Luke viii. 3 *ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς*, 2 Cor. i. 23 *φειδόμενος ὑμῶν οὐκ ἦλθον*, 1 Cor. vii. 31 ; Heb. ii. 3 ; Luke xxi. 4 ; ix. 32, etc.) ; partly in its regularly retaining the element of *time*, which can be done more
357 completely in Greek than in Latin and German on account of its copiousness in participial forms. The temporal force of the participles corresponds, moreover, to the observations made in § 40 upon the separate tenses.

The simple and ordinary use of the Participle is exemplified,

a. of the Present, in Acts xx. 23 *τὸ πνεῦμα διαμαρτύρεταί μοι λέγον* etc., Rom. viii. 24 *ἐλπὶς βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς*, 1 Thess. ii. 4 *θεῷ τῷ δοκιμάζοντι τὰς καρδίας*, 1 Pet. i. 7 *χρυσίου τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου*, Heb. vii. 8 — something now present or uniformly occurring at all times (Schoem. Plut. Agid. p. 153 ; Schaef. Plut. V. 211 sq.).

b. of the Aorist, in Col. ii. 12 *τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐγείραντος Χριστὸν*
305 *ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν*, Rom. v. 16 *δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος* (something that
6th ed. occurred once by itself), Acts ix. 21.

c. of the Perfect, in Acts xxii. 3 *ἀνὴρ γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ* (past facts still operative), Jno. xix. 35 *ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν*, Matt. xxvii. 37 *ἐπέθηκαν ... τὴν αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην*, Acts xxiii. 3 ; 1 Pet. i. 23 ; 2 Pet. ii. 6 ; Jno. v. 10 ; vii. 15 ; Eph. iii. 18.

d. of the Future (rare in the N. T.) in 1 Cor. xv. 37 *οὐ τὸ σῶμα*
320 *τὸ γενησόμενον σπείρεις*, viewed from the past, Heb. iii. 5 *Μωϋσῆς*
7th ed.

πιστὸς . . . ὡς θεράπων εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων *of those things which were to be spoken* (revealed); cf. Acts viii. 27; xxiv. 11; Luke xxii. 49.

Moreover, the Present Participle is used a) for the Imperf. in connection with a past tense; as, Acts xxv. 3 παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν αἰτούμενοι χάριν, Rev. xv. 1 εἶδον ἀγγέλους ἑπτὰ ἔχοντας πληγάς, Heb. xi. 21 Ἰακὼβ ἀποθνήσκων . . . ηὐλόγησεν, Acts vii. 26 ὤφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις, xviii. 5; xx. 9; xxi. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 23; 2 Cor. iii. 7 (Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 264); also of a continued state of things, Acts xix. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 5. b) of that which will immediately or infallibly occur; as, Matt. xxvi. 28 τὸ αἷμα τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, vi. 30 τὸν χόρτον αὔριον εἰς κλίβανον βαλλόμενον, 1 Cor. xv. 57; Jas. v. 1. Accordingly, ὁ ἐρχόμενος used of the Messiah, הַבָּא, is not *venturus*, but *he that cometh* (the *coming* one), he of whom it is firmly believed that he is coming, Matt. xi. 3; Luke vii. 19, etc.

Likewise ὤν, joined to a Preterite or an adverb of time, is not unfrequently an Imperfect Participle; as, Jno. i. 49; v. 13; xi. 31, 49; xxi. 11; Acts vii. 2; xi. 1; xviii. 24, 1 Cor. i. 28; 2 C. viii. 9; Eph. ii. 13 νυνὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ὑμεῖς οἵ ποτε ὄντες etc. Col. i. 21; 1 Tim. i. 13 μὲ τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον. Cf. Aristot. rhet. 2, 10, 13, πρὸς τοὺς μυριοστὸν ὄντας, Lucian. dial. mar. 13, 2 ὀψὲ ζηλοτυπεῖς ὑπερόπτης πρότερον 358
ὤν. But in Jno. iii. 13 ὤν (see Lücke and BCrus. in loc.) means: *who* (essentially) *is in heaven, who belongs to heaven.*[1] The same applies to i. 18. But ix. 25 ὅτι τυφλὸς ὢν ἄρτι βλέπω is probably: *I being blind* (from my infancy), *a blind man;* only in so far as a reference to a *previous* condition is included in ἄρτι, can it perhaps also be translated, *whereas I was.* An undoubted Present occurs in 1 Cor. ix. 19 ἐλεύθερος ὢν ἐκ πάντων πᾶσιν ἐμαυτὸν ἐδούλωσα *being free* (though I am free), I made myself servant (the Apostle's ἐλευθερία was something permanent). On the other hand, in Rev. vii. 2 εἶδον . . ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα (which Eichhorn strangely enough declared to be a solecism) *I saw him ascend* (while he was ascending) an Imperf. Part. is quite appropriate, as denoting something not at the moment completed. But in xiv. 13 ἀποθνήσκοντες can only be the Present Part.

In many passages formerly the Present Part. was improperly taken for the Future, in most of which the force of the Present is quite sufficient: 306
in connection, 6th ed.

[1] Ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρ., in the signification of qui *erat* in coelo, would nearly coincide in sense with ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. καταβάς. It must here, however, denote something special and more emphatic, and a climax in these predicates is not to be overlooked. Yet ὁ ὤν does not form a third predicate co-ordinate with the two others, but is, as *Lücke* correctly observes, explanatory of the predicate ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ.

a. with a Pres. or Imperat., as Rom. xv. 25 *πορεύομαι διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις* (the *διακονεῖν* begins simultaneously with the journey), 1 Pet. i. 9 *ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ... κομιζόμενοι as receiving* (they are so already in the assurance of faith), Jas. ii. 9. As to 2 Pet. ii. 9 see Huther.

b. with an Aor. (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 234), as 2 Pet. ii. 4 *παρέδωκεν εἰς*
321 *κρίσιν τηρουμένους as those who are kept* (contemplated from a *present* point
7th ed. of view), Acts xxi. 2 *εὑρόντες πλοῖον διαπερῶν εἰς Φοινίκην* on her passage to, *bound for* (Xen. Eph. 3, 6 in.), Luke ii. 45 *ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσ. ἀναζητοῦντες αὐτόν seeking him* (which began already on the way back), Mark viii. 11; x. 2 (Fut. Part. in reference to an action only purposed, Acts xxiv. 17; xxv. 13).

c. with a Perf., as Acts xv. 27 *ἀπεστάλκαμεν Ἰούδαν καὶ Σίλαν ... ἀπαγγέλλοντας τὰ αὐτά announcing, with the announcement* (they assumed the character of announcers simultaneously with their entrance on their journey), 1 Cor. ii. 1; Demosth. Dionys. 739 c.; Pol. 28, 10, 7. In 2 Pet. iii. 11 *τούτων πάντων λυομένων* means, *since all these things are dissolving*, that is, are by their nature destined for dissolution; the doom of dissolution is already as it were inherent in them. *Λυθησομένων* would express only mere futurity: as their dissolution will at some time take place. The Apostolic (Pauline) terms *οἱ ἀπολλύμενοι, οἱ σωζόμενοι* (subst.) denote:
359 *those who are perishing, those who are becoming saved* etc., not merely at some future time but already, inasmuch as they refused to believe and therefore are the prey of eternal death. As to Acts xxi. 3, see no. 5.

d. with a Conjunct. exhortat., as Heb. xiii. 13 *ἐξερχώμεθα ... τὸν ὀνειδισμὸν αὐτοῦ φέροντες*, where the bearing etc. is annexed directly to the *ἐξερχ.*, whereas the Fut. Part. would have removed it to some indefinite and distant time. Cf. also 1 Cor. iv. 14.

Still less can the Pres. Part. take the place of the Aorist. In 2 Cor. x. 14 *οὐ γὰρ ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι εἰς ὑμᾶς ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτούς* means: *as though we reached not unto you* (which, however, is the case). In 2 Pet. ii. 18 *ἀποφεύγοντας*, which Lchm. has already adopted, denotes that the escaping has only just begun; such persons are most liable to be misled. As to Eph. ii. 21 and iv. 22, see Meyer.

The Aorist Part., in the course of a narration, expresses either a simultaneous action (Krü. 155), Acts i. 24 *προσευξάμενοι εἶπον praying they said* (the prayer follows), Rom. iv. 20; Eph. i. 9; Col. ii. 13; Phil. ii. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 5; or a previously past action, where we should expect the Plup., Matt. xxii. 25 *ὁ πρῶτος γαμήσας ἐτελεύτησε*, Acts v. 10; xiii. 51; 2 Pet. ii. 4; Eph. i. 4 f.; ii. 16. If the principal verb refers to something future, the Aor. Part. is equivalent to the Latin Fut. exact.; as, 1 Pet. ii. 12 *ἵνα ... ἐκ τῶν καλῶν ἔργων ἐποπτεύσαντες δοξάσωσιν τὸν θεόν*, iii. 2; Eph. iv. 25 *ἀποθέμενοι τὸ ψεῦδος λαλεῖτε ἀλήθειαν*, Mark xiii. 13; Acts xxiv. 25;

Rom. xv. 28; Heb. iv. 3; Hm. Vig. 774. Likewise the Perf. Part. has sometimes in narration the sense of a Plup.; as, Jno. ii. 9 *οἱ διάκονοι ἤδεισαν οἱ ἠντληκότες*, Acts xviii. 2 *εὑρὼν Ἰουδαῖον ... προσφάτως ἐληλυθότα ἀπὸ τ. Ἰταλίας*, Heb. ii. 9; Rev. ix. 1.

The Aor. Part. never stands for the Fut. Part.: — not in Jno. xi. 2 (where the Evangelist alludes to an event long past, which he narrates for the first time in chap. xii.); also not in Heb. ii. 10, where *ἀγαγόντα* 307
refers to Christ sojourning in the flesh, who even while on earth led many 6th ed.
to glory (a work which began with his very appearance). As to Heb. 322
ix. 12 see below, 6. It is a misuse of parallel passages to translate Mark 7th ed.
xvi. 2 *ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου*: *as the sun rose* (so Ebrard still), because Jno. xx. 1, cf. Luke xxiv. 1, has *σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης*. Such minute discrepancies in the gospels one must have the courage to tolerate. As to Jno. vi. 33, 50 *ἄρτος ὁ καταβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, compared with *ἄρτος ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* in verses 41, 51, see Lücke. Neither is the Aor. Part. used for the Perf. Part. in 1 Pet. i. 13.

The Perf. Pass. Part. *κατεγνωσμένος* in Gal. ii. 11 is erroneously rendered 360
reprehendendus. According to grammar and the context it means *blamed*, see Mey. Likewise in Rev. xxi. 8 *ἐβδελυγμένος* is *abominated*. On the other hand, in Heb. xii. 18 the Pres. Part. *ψηλαφώμενον* denotes *touchable*, for what *is touched* has the property of touchableness, as *τὰ βλεπόμενα* means *things visible*. Cf. Kritz, Sallust. II. 401 sq.

Aor. and Perf. Participles are connected and the distinction between them maintained: 2 Cor. xii. 21 *τῶν προημαρτηκότων κ. μὴ μετανοησάντων*, 1 Pet. ii. 10 *οἱ οὐκ ἠλεημένοι νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες* (Sept.) — the former denoting a state, the latter a fact. As to 1 Jno. v. 18 see Lücke; cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 129. The connection of the Pres. Part. and the Aor., as in Jno. xxi. 24; Heb. vi. 7, 10, or of the Perf. Part. and the Pres., as in Col. ii. 7, in a single proposition, hardly requires to be mentioned.

2. As respects grammatical construction, the Participle is used either a. as a complement to the principal clause, as in Matt. xix. 22 *ἀπῆλθεν λυπούμενος* (Rost 701); or b. it forms for the sake of periodic compactness a secondary clause, and can be resolved by a relative or by a conjunction (Rost 703; Mtth. 1311 ff.), Jno. xv. 2 *πᾶν κλῆμα μὴ φέρον καρπόν which does not bear fruit*, Rom. xvi. 1 *συνίστημι Φοίβην, οὖσαν διάκονον*, Luke xvi. 14 etc.; Rom. ii. 27 *ἡ ἀκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα if it* (thereby, that it) *fulfils*, Acts v. 4 *οὐχὶ μένον σοὶ ἔμενε; when it remained* (unsold), did it not remain thine? Rom. vii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 4; 1 Tim. iv. 4 (Xen. M. 1, 4, 14; 2, 3, 9; Plat. Symp. 208 d.; Schaef. Melet. p. 57; Mtth. 1314), Acts iv. 21 *ἀπέλυσαν αὐτοὺς μηδὲν εὑρίσκοντες* etc. *because they found nothing*, 1 Cor. xi. 29; Heb. vi. 6 (Jude 5;

Jas. ii. 25), Xen. M. 1, 2, 22; Lucian. dial. m. 27, 8; Rom. i. 32 *οἵτινες τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιγνόντες οὐ μόνον* etc. *though they knew* etc. (had become well aware), 1 Cor. ix. 19; 1 Thess. ii. 6; Jas. iii. 4 etc.; cf. Xen. M. 3, 10, 13; Philostr. Apoll. 2, 25; Lucian. dial. m. 26, 1. Most frequently in narration the Participle is to be resolved by a particle of time; as, 2 Pet. ii. 5 *ὄγδοον Νῶε . . . ἐφύλαξεν, κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἐπάξας*, *as* (when) he brought upon the world, Luke ii. 45 *μὴ εὑρόντες ὑπέστρεψαν after* they had not found, Phil. ii. 19; Acts iv. 18 *καλέσαντες αὐτοὺς παρήγγειλαν*, Matt. ii. 3; Acts xxi. 28 *ἐπέβαλον ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας κράζοντες while* they cried etc., Rom. iv. 20 *ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ* etc.

361 When Participles are used limitatively (*although*), this import is often
308 indicated by *καίτοι* or *καίπερ* prefixed, as in Phil. iii. 4; Heb. iv. 3; v. 8;
6th ed. vii. 5; 2 Pet. i. 12; cf. Xen. C. 4, 5, 32; Plat. Protag. 318 b.; Diod. S.
323 3, 7; 17, 39. Sometimes this meaning is made prominent by an antithetical
7th ed. *ὅμως* (Krü. 202), 1 Cor. xiv. 7 *ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα . . . ἐὰν διαστολὴν μὴ δῷ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον* etc. things without life, although giving out sound, will *nevertheless* not be understood, unless etc.

3. The connecting of two or more Participles in different relations (co-ordinate or subordinate one to another) without the copula *καί* with one and the same principal verb, is particularly frequent in the narrative style. This takes place not only,

a. When one Participle *precedes*, and another *follows*, the finite verb, as Luke iv. 35 *ῥῖψαν αὐτὸ τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν throwing him down* (after he had thrown him down), *the evil spirit came out of him without doing him any harm*, x. 30; Acts xiv. 19; xv. 24; xvi. 23; Mark vi. 2; 2 Cor. vii. 1; Tit. ii. 12 f.; Heb. vi. 6; x. 12 f.; 2 Pet. ii. 19 (Lucian. Philops. 24, and Peregr. 25); but more frequently,

b. When the Participles immediately follow one another without a copula, as Matt. xxviii. 2 *ἄγγελος κυρίου καταβὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, προσελθὼν ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον* etc., Acts v. 5 *ἀκούων Ἀνανίας τοὺς λόγους τούτους, πεσὼν ἐξέψυξε*, Luke ix. 16 *λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους . . ., ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν*, 1 Cor. xi. 4 *πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων, καταισχύνει* etc. *every man that prayeth or prophesieth with his head covered* etc.. Luke vii. 37 f.; xvi. 23; xxiii. 48; Acts xiv. 14; xxi. 2; xxv. 6; Mark i. 41; v. 25–27; viii. 6; Col. i. 3 f. *εὐχαριστοῦμεν . . . προσευχόμενοι . . . ἀκούσαντες while we pray, . . . since* (after) *we heard*, 1 Thess. i. 2 f.; Heb. i. 3; xi. 7; xii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 58; Jno. xiii. 1 f.; Col.

ii. 13; Phil. ii. 7; Philem. 4; Jude 20, etc. Nothing is more frequent in Greek authors, cf. Xen. Hell. 1, 6, 8; Cyr. 4, 6, 4; Plato, rep. 2, 366 a.; Gorg. 471 b.; Strabo 3, 165; Lucian. asin. 18; Alex. 19; Xen. Eph. 3, 5; Alciphr. 3, 43 in.; Arrian. Al. 3, 30, 7; see Heindorf, Plat. Protag. p. 562; Hm. Eurip. Io p. 842; Stallb. Plat. Phileb. § 32, and Plat. Euthyphr. p. 27; Apol. p. 46 sq.; Boisson. Aristaenet. p. 257; Jacob ad Lucian. Tox. p. 43; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. II. 322, etc. (In several passages sometimes a smaller and sometimes a greater number of Codd. have the copula *καί*, as in Acts ix. 40; Mark xiv. 22, etc.)

The Participles stand otherwise related to each other in Luke ii. 12 *εὑρήσετε βρέφος ἐσπαργανωμένον κείμενον ἐν φάτνῃ ye shall find a child swaddled, lying in a manger*, where the first Part. takes the place of an adjective. 362

4. When the Participle is employed merely as a complement or predicate, it fills sometimes the office discharged in Latin and German by the Inf. (Rost 694 ff.), viz. in the well-known phrases:

a. Acts v. 42 *οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες* (xiii. 10; Heb. x. 2; Rev. iv. 8), Acts xii. 16 *ἐπέμενε κρούων*, Luke vii. 45 (2 Macc. v. 27), 2 Pet. i. 19 *ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες*, Acts x. 33; xv. 29; Phil. iv. 14; 3 Jno. 6 (Plato, symp. 174 c.; Phaed. 60 c.; Her. 5, 24, 26), 309 2 Pet. ii. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 13; b. Mark xvi. 5 *εἶδον νεανίσκον καθήμενον*, 6th ed. Acts ii. 11 *ἀκούομεν λαλούντων αὐτῶν*, vii. 12; Mark xiv. 58. Logi- 324 7th ed. cally, the Participle is in these instances as appropriate, at least, as the Infinitive; the Greeks used the former to mark a nice distinction which other nations failed to note. *Οὐκ ἐπαύοντο διδάσκοντες* is, *teaching* (or, as teachers) *they did not cease;*[1] *εἶδον καθήμενον they saw him* (*as one*) *sitting*. The Part. denotes an action or a state already existing, not first occasioned or produced by the principal verb; see, in general, Mtth. 1228; Krü. 191 ff.[2]

We further specify the following instances as of less frequent occurrence: Under a. 1 Cor. xiv. 18 *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶν* (rec.)[3] *that I speak* (as one ...

[1] It would make no essential difference to regard this use of the Part. in the nominative, with *G. T. A. Krüger* (Untersuch. aus dem Gebiete der lat. Sprachl. III. 356 ff., 404 ff.), as attraction. Further, cf. *Hm.* emend. rat. p. 146 f.

[2] More precise distinctions on this head as to Greek are laid down by *Weller*, Bemerkungen zur gr. Syntax. Meiningen, 1845. 4to.

[3] *Lchm.* and *Tdf.* on the authority of many uncial Codd. [Sin. also] give λαλῶ; then we have two unconnected clauses side by side: *I thank God, I speak more than you all* (for *that I speak more than you all*), cf. *Bornem.* Xen. conv. p. 71. The Cod. Alex. omits both λαλῶν and λαλῶ.

speaking), cf. Her. 9, 79; Acts xvi. 34 *ἠγαλλιάσατο πεπιστευκὼς τῷ θεῷ* (Eurip. Hipp. 8; Soph. Phil. 882; Lucian. paras. 3; fug. 12; Dion. H. IV. 2238); but Rom. vii. 13 does not come under this head, see Rück. cf. Heusing. Plut. paedag. p. 19; Under b. Luke viii. 46 *ἐγὼ ἔγνων δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν* (Thuc. 1, 25 *γνόντες ... οὐδεμίαν σφίσιν ἀπὸ Κερκύρας τιμωρίαν οὖσαν*, Xen. C. 1, 4, 7, see Monk, Eurip. Hipp. 304 and Alcest. 152),[1] Heb. xiii. 23 *γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον ye know that ... is set at liberty*, Acts xxiv. 10 *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὄντα σε κριτὴν τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ ἐπιστάμενος*, cf. Demosth. ep. 4 p. 123 etc. (but in Luke iv. 41 *ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι*, where also in Greek prose the Participle would probably have been employed, cf. Mehlhorn in Allg. L. Z. 1833, no. 110, yet see Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 580), 2 Jno. 7 *οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Χριστὸν ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον*, 1 Jno. iv. 2 *πνεῦμα ὃ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα*.[2] As to verbs *dicendi* with a Part. see Mtth. 1289; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 109. In Greek prose the verb *αἰσχύνεσθαι* also is especially so used, e.g. Xen. C. 3, 2, 16 *αἰσχυνοίμεθ' ἄν σοι μὴ ἀποδιδόντες*, 5, 1, 21 *αἰσχύνομαι λέγων*, Mem. 2, 6, 39; Diog. L. 6, 8; Liban. oratt. p. 525 b. Yet just here we see with what propriety the Participle is chosen in the cases just noted. For this verb is also construed in Greek authors with the Inf. But there is an essential difference between the two constructions; see Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 286 sq.[3] The Part. is used only when a person is now doing (or has done) something of which he (at the moment of acting) is ashamed; but the Inf., when shame in view of something to be done (but not yet actually performed) is to be expressed (cf. e.g. Isocr. ad Philipp. p. 224, and big. p. 842; Xen. M. 3, 7, 5). Luke, observing this distinction, has written correctly xvi. 3 *ἐπαιτεῖν αἰσχύνομαι to beg I am ashamed* (Sir. iv. 26; Sus. 11); had the speaker already begun to beg, *ἐπαιτῶν αἰσχύνομαι* must have been used. *Ἄρχομαι* is uniformly in the N. T., and commonly in Greek authors, construed with the Infin., as *he began speaking* is less appropriate than *he continued speaking*. Yet see Rost 698.

363 310 6th ed. 325 7th ed.

[1] Eph. iii. 19 *γνῶναι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ Χριστοῦ* cannot be referred to this head, as many expositors refer it; for the Part., by its position between the article and substantive, is too clearly marked as an adjective. For another reason, also, Phil. ii. 28 *ἵνα ἰδόντες αὐτὸν πάλιν χαρῆτε* must not be referred to the above construction. The sense is: *that ye, beholding him, may again rejoice.*

[2] The passage of Isocr. Paneg. c. 8, usually adduced as a parallel (even still by *Mtth.* 1289), was corrected by *Hier. Wolf*, cf. *Baiter* in loc. *Weber*, Demosth. p. 278, discusses another matter.

[3] With *πυνθάνομαι* both constructions coincide; see *Ellendt*, Arrian. Al. I. 145.

Ἀκούειν, which also is occasionally construed with a predicative Part., and that not merely in the literal sense of immediate hearing as in Rev. v. 13; Acts ii. 11, but also in that of *learning, being informed* (through others) as in Luke iv. 23; Acts vii. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 11 ἀκούομέν τινας περιπατοῦντας etc., 3 Jno. 4 (Xen. C. 2, 4, 12),[1] is in the latter sense fre- 364
quently construed with ὅτι, once [by Paul] with the Acc. with the Inf., 1 Cor. xi. 18 ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν (ὑπάρχοντα), [once also by John, xii. 18 ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον]; cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 1; 4, 16. The construction is different in Eph. iv. 22 if ἀποθέσθαι ὑμᾶς ... τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον depends on ἠκούσατε or ἐδιδάχθητε in vs. 21 (*that ye must put off*); see § 44, 3, p. 322.

The use of the Part. examined in this section is in Greek authors, even prose writers, much more diversified than in the N. T. (see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 235, and Achill. Tat. p. 828; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 500; Schaef. Eurip. Hec. p. 31). The construction of παύεσθαι with the Inf. is disapproved even by ancient grammarians, though erroneously, see Schaef. Apoll. Rhod. II. 223; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 223 sq.

Also in 1 Tim. v. 13 ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσι περιερχόμεναι the Part. is by nearly all recent expositors thought to be used for the Inf.: *they learn* (accustom themselves) (*to be*) *going about idle* etc. This gives a suitable meaning. But in all cases where the Part. joined to μανθάνειν refers to the subject, that verb signifies to *perceive, comprehend, observe, remark* something which is already existing, as in Her. 3, 1 διαβεβλημένος ὑπὸ Ἀμάσιος οὐ μανθάνεις (see Valcken. in loc.), Soph. Antig. 532; Aesch. Prom. 62; Thuc. 6, 39; Plut. paed. 8, 12; Dion. H. IV. 2238; Lucian. 326
dial. d. 16, 2;[2] but in the sense of *learn* it is used with the Inf., Phil. iv. 11 7th ed.
also 1 Tim. v. 4;[3] Mtth. 1228. The preceding construction, then, must 311
have been incorrectly extended beyond the proper bounds. Perhaps, 6th ed.
however, μανθ. is to be connected with ἀργαί, and περιερχόμεναι to be taken as a proper Part. (they learn idleness, going about etc.). Ἀργαὶ μ. would then be a concise expression, like what sometimes occurs elsewhere also with an adjective (Plat. Euthyd. 276 b. εἰ ἀμαθεῖς ἄρα σοφοὶ μανθάνουσιν, and more frequently διδάσκειν τινὰ σοφόν), which does not like the Part. include the notion of tense or mood.[4] This exposition, which Beza, Piscator, and others adopted and which Huther has recently approved, is supported by this, that in the sequel ἀργαί is repeated as the leading word, and to the climax φλύαροι καὶ περίεργοι a Part. is likewise annexed, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα.

[1] Cf. *Rost*, in his griech. Wörterb. I. 143.

[2] In Xen. C. 6, 2, 29 ἕως ἂν μάθωμεν ὑδροπόται γενόμενοι (a passage which would not be altogether decisive), λάθωμεν was long ago substituted for μάθωμεν.

[3] *Matthies* has passed over the grammatical difficulty in silence. *Leo*, after *Casaubon.* ad Athen. p. 452, would render μανθάνουσι by *solent;* but he has not observed that this meaning belongs only to the Preterite.

[4] Under this head comes also Dio Chr. 55, 558 ὁ Σωκράτης ὅτι μὲν παῖς ὢν ἐμάνθανε λιθοξόος τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς τέχνην, ἀκηκόαμεν (*Socrates learned as stone-cutter* etc.).

A verb of the kind specified under a. is once construed with an Adjective — which cannot be thought strange, Acts xxvii. 33 τεσσαρεςκαιδεκάτην
365 σήμερον ἡμέραν προσδοκῶντες, ἄσιτοι (ὄντες) διατελεῖτε, cf. Xen. C. 1, 5, 10 ἀναγώνιστος διατελεῖ, Hell. 2, 3, 25.

Some erroneously think the Part. used for the Inf. in 1 Tim. i. 12 πιστόν με ἡγήσατο θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν. The meaning is: *he counted me faithful, in that he appointed me to the ministry* (by that very act showing that he counted me faithful). In another sense, indeed, θέσθαι εἰς διακονίαν might also have been employed.

5. Present participles are frequently used (in the narrative style) with the verb εἶναι, and in particular with ἦν or ἦσαν (yet also with the Fut.): — sometimes, as it seems, simply for the corresponding person of their finite verb (Aristot. metaph. 4, 7; Bhdy. 334),[1] as in Mark xiii. 25 οἱ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔσονται πίπτοντες (where immediately follows, as a parallel clause, καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς σαλευθήσονται, — Matt. has πεσοῦνται), Jas. i. 17 πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον ἄνωθέν ἐστι καταβαῖνον etc., Luke v. 1; Acts ii. 2; sometimes, and indeed more frequently, to express continuance (rather a state than an act),[2] which might also be indicated, though less sensibly in reference to the past, by the form of
327 the Imperfect[3] (cf. Beza ad Matt. vii. 29), as Mark xv. 43 ἦν προς-
7th ed. δεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke xxiii. 51), Acts viii. 28 ἦν τε ὑποστρέφων καὶ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἅρματος αὐτοῦ (an Imperf.
312 immediately follows), i. 10; ii. 42; viii. 13; x. 24; Matt. vii. 29;
6th ed. Mark ix. 4; xiv. 54; Luke iv. 31; v. 10; vi. 12; xxiv. 13. Hence this construction is used especially where there is a reference to some other circumstance, as in Luke xxiv. 32 ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν καιομένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς ἐλάλει etc., or to what is customary, as in Mark ii. 18 ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου ... νηστεύοντες (they used to fast), to which exposition Mey. without reason objects. Also in Luke xxi. 24 Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν duration seems intended to be expressed, while the two Futures preceding, πεσοῦνται and αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται, denote transient occurrences, cf. Matt. xxiv. 9. In other passages εἶναι is not the mere auxiliary verb: Mark x. 32 ἦσαν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἀναβαίνοντες εἰς Ἱεροσ. *they were to be on the road* (cf. vs. 17), *going up to Jerusalem* (Lucian.

[1] In some tenses (as the Perf. and Plup. Pass. Plur.) this circumlocution, as is well known, has become predominant and figures in the paradigm of the verb.

[2] What Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 34 says of the distinction between this construction and the finite verb amounts to this.

[3] It is a characteristic of popular diction to expand concise expressions for the sake of greater clearness or force; see § 44, 3, p. 324.

dial. mar. 6, 2), v. 5, 11 (Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 219) ii. 6; Luke 366
ii. 8; xxiv. 53; Mark xiv. 4 ἦσάν τινες ἀγανακτοῦντες *there were some* (present) *who had indignation;* or the Part. has assumed rather the nature of an adjective, as in Matt. xix. 22 ἦν ἔχων κτήματα *he was possessed of property*, ix. 36; Luke i. 20 (cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 34). Perhaps also the verbal idea was sometimes dissected into a Part. and Subst. verb in order to give it in the form of a noun more prominence (Mdv. 204), 2 Cor. v. 19 (see Mey.), 1 Cor. xiv. 9; Col. ii. 23. In Luke vii. 8 ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπός εἰμι ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος the Part. appears to be not directly dependent on εἶναι, but an epithet belonging to a substantive. In Jno. i. 9 ἦν ... ἐρχόμενον are not to be taken together, but ἐρχόμενον belongs as an attributive to ἄνθρωπον, see Meyer. Moreover, this use of the Pres. Part. is not uncommon in Greek authors; and they (particularly Herodot.) employ thus the other Participles also besides the Pres., cf. Eurip. Herc. fur. 312 sq. εἰ μὲν σθενόντων τῶν ἐμῶν βραχιόνων ἦν τις σ' ὑβρίζων, Her. 3, 99 ἀπαρνεόμενός ἐστιν, Xen. An. 2, 2, 13 ἦν ἡ στατηγία οὐδὲν ἄλλο δυναμένη, Herod. 1, 3, 12 κρατήσας ἦν τοῖς ὅπλοις (where προσηγάγετο precedes), Lucian. eunuch. 2 δικασταὶ ψηφοφοροῦντες ἦσαν οἱ ἄριστοι. See Reiz, Lucian. VI. 537 Lehm.; Couriers, Lucian. asin. p. 219; Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 12; Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 597; Boisson. Philostr. 660, and Nicet. p. 81; Mtth. 1302. In later writers (e.g. Agath. 126, 7; 135, 5; 175, 14; 279, 7 etc., Ephraem. see Index under εἶναι) and in the Sept. it occurs much more frequently, though in the Sept. the Hebrew seldom gave occasion to this construction. On the other hand, the circumlocution of the Part. and *to be* for the finite verb became established, as is well known, in Aramaean; and so in Palestinean authors a national predilection 328
for the above construction may have prevailed. 7th ed.

Acts xxi. 3 ἐκεῖσε ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἀποφορτιζόμενον τὸν γόμον cannot be rendered, with Grotius, Valckenaer and others: eo navis merces *expositura erat*, but means: *thither the vessel was unlading its cargo* i.e. in the narrative style: thither it was going in order to unload, (to take ἐκεῖσε for ἐκεῖ — cf. Bornem. Schol. p. 176 — is unnecessary). That the phrase ἦν ἀποφ. refers to what the ship was just then freighted with is not to be 313
overlooked. 6th ed.

In Luke iii. 23 ἦν ... ἀρχόμενος are not to be joined together, but ἦν ἐτῶν τριάκοντα forms the principal predicate, and ἀρχόμενος is annexed as a closer limitation. The idiom mentioned in Vig. p. 355 is not similar. Of one who is entering on his thirtieth year it cannot be said: *he is beginning thirty years;* he is, rather, on the point of terminating thirty years.

367 In Jas. iii. 15 *οὐκ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ σοφία ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη ἀλλ' ἐπίγειος, ψυχική* etc. the Part. is employed adjectively, and *ἔστιν* belongs likewise to the adjectives following; cf. Franke, Demosth. p. 42.

Ὑπάρχειν with the Part. in Acts viii. 16 *μόνον βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*, is not a mere circumlocution for the finite verb, for *βεβαπτ. ἦσαν* would be the regular expression, there being no other form for the Plup. In Jas. ii. 15 *λειπόμενοι* is annexed as a predicate to *γυμνοὶ ὑπάρχωσιν*. In part, however, Luke xxiii. 12 *προϋπῆρχον ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες* might be referred to this head, for which *πρότερον ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ἦσαν* might have been used. See as to these combinations of *ὑπάρχειν* with the Part. *ὤν*, Bornem. Schol. p. 143.

Γίνομαι also (in the sense of *εἶναι*) is never in the N. T. employed with a Part. (Heind. Plat. Soph. 273 sq.; Lob. Soph. Aj. v. 588) to form a periphrasis of this sort. In Heb. v. 12 *γεγόνατε χρείαν ἔχοντες* signifies: *ye have come to have need.* In Mark ix. 3 *τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐγένοντο στίλβοντα* means: *became shining.* In the same way are to be explained Luke xxiv. 37; 2 Cor. vi. 14; Rev. xvi. 10; but in Mark i. 4 *ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης* (exstitit Joannes) is to be taken by itself, and the Participles that follow are added as explanatory. Just so Jno. i. 6.

The construction in the following passages cannot by any means be taken as a circumlocution for a finite verb: *θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν* etc. Phil. ii. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 4, etc. (usually with the omission of the copula, Rom. viii. 33; Heb. iii. 4, etc.) *it is God that worketh* etc., cf. Fr. Rom. II. 212 sq.; Krü. 191.

6. Greek prose authors seldom take the liberty of omitting the Subs. verb in such constructions, so as to make the Part. stand exactly for a finite verb;[1] and then it is done only in simple tense
329 and mood forms (see Hm. Vig. 776; Mtth. 1303; Siebelis, Pausan.
7th ed. III. 106; Wannowski, synt. anom. 202 sq.).[2] Expositors, disregarding the corrections of Greek philologers (Hm. Vig. 770, 776 sq.; Bremi in the Philol. Beitr. a. d. Schweiz. I. 172 ff.; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 146 and Schol. in Luc. p. 183; Döderlein, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 593 sq; Bhdy. 470), have often and unhesitatingly assumed such a usage in the N. T. But in nearly all the passages so explained,
314 a finite verb either precedes or follows, to which the Part. is to be
6th ed. joined (and then merely the usual punctuation of the text must not be minded); or there is an anacoluthon, owing to the writer's

[1] Cf. *Fr.* Rom. I. 282. As to the Byzantine use of Participles simply for finite verbs, see Index to Malalas, in the Bonn ed. p. 797. (We are not speaking here of the poets; see e.g. *Hm.* review of *Müller's* Eumenid. S. 23.)

[2] The restriction under which *Mehlhorn* in the Allg. Lit. Z. 1833. no. 78 maintains this ellipsis, can neither be fully justified on philosophic grounds, nor can instances be found, especially in later authors, to support it.

having lost sight of the construction with which he began (Poppo, Thuc. III. III. 138). Several such passages have been correctly 368
explained by Ostermann in Crenii exercitatt. II. 522 sq.

a. In 2 Cor. iv. 13 ἔχοντες must be joined to the πιστεύομεν following: *as we have ... we also believe.* In 2 Pet. ii. 1 both ἀρνούμενοι and ἐπάγοντες are to be connected with παρεισάξουσιν; they are not, however, co-ordinate with each other, but ἐπάγοντες is annexed to the clause οἵτινες ... ἀρνούμενοι. In Rom. v. 11 ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι has not so close a correspondence to σωθησόμεθα, that καυχώμεθα (var.) was to have been expected; but the meaning appears to be *but not only shall we be saved* (simply and actually), but while we, so that we etc. (expressive of the joyous consciousness of the saved). In 2 Cor. viii. 20 στελλόμενοι is to be connected, as to the sense, with συνεπέμψαμεν in vs. 18. In Heb. vi. 8 ἐκφέρουσα does not stand for ἐκφέρει, but this Part. corresponds to πιοῦσα and τίκτουσα in vs. 7, and by δέ is placed in opposition to both; but an ἐστί is to be supplied with ἀδόκιμος and κατάρας ἐγγύς. In 2 Pet. iii. 5 συνεστῶσα is a proper Part. (attributive), and the preceding ἦσαν avails also for ἡ γῆ. In Heb. vii. 2 ἑρμηνευόμενος must be joined to Μελχισ. in vs. 1., as ὁ συναντ. and ᾧ ἐμέρισεν are parenthetical clauses, and the principal verb in the sentence follows all the predicates in vs. 3 μένει ἱερεύς etc. In Eph. v. 21 ὑποτασσόμενοι, like the other Participles in vss. 19, 20, certainly belongs with the principal verb πληροῦσθε ἐν πν., and is not to be taken for an Imperative, as has been done by Koppe, Flatt, and others; the αἱ γυναῖκες etc. in vs. 22 is then joined, without a special verb (for ὑποτάσσεσθε is undoubtedly a gloss), to ὑποτασσόμενοι, as a further illustration. Likewise in 1 Pet. v. 7 the Participles are connected with the foregoing Imperative in vs. 6; and 1 Pet. iii. 1 refers back to ii. 18, where the Part. is to be joined to the Imperat. in vs. 17. In the same way in 2 Thess. iii. 8 ἐργαζόμενοι is to be joined to ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ, and this again corresponds to δωρεάν as an adjunct to the verb ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν. In Heb. x. 8 λέγων belongs to the verb following in vs. 9, εἴρηκεν. 330
In x. 16 διδούς may very well be connected with διαθήσομαι. Rom. 7th ed.
vii 13 has long since been correctly explained. 1 Pet. iv. 8 needs no explanation.

b. Acts xxiv. 5 begins with the Part. εὑρόντες τὸν ἄνδρα, and vs. 6 should have continued ἐκρατήσαμεν αὐτόν etc.; instead of this the writer annexes this principal verb to the interposed relative clause ὃς καὶ ... ἐπείρασε. In 2 Pet. i. 17 λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ

etc. the structure is interrupted by the parenthetical clauses φωνῆς ... εὐδόκησα; and the apostle continues in vs. 18 with καὶ ταύτην
369 τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, instead of saying, as he intended, ἡμᾶς εἶχε ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούσαντας, or something similar (Fr. diss.
315 in 2 Cor. II. 44).[1] In 2 Cor. v. 6 θαῤῥοῦντες, after several interme-
6th ed. diate clauses, is resumed in θαῤῥοῦμεν δέ vs. 8. In vii. 5 οὐδεμίαν ἔσχηκεν ἄνεσιν ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ θλιβόμενοι, ἔξωθεν μάχαι etc., ἤμεθα (from ἡ σὰρξ ἡμῶν) may be supplied (Hm. Vig. p. 770); but an anacoluthon may also be assumed (Fr. as above, p. 49), as if Paul had written in the previous part of the sentence οὐδεμίαν ἄνεσιν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ σαρκὶ ἡμῶν. In v. 12 ἀφορμὴν διδόντες must be taken as a Part., but the foregoing clause must be understood as if it had run οὐ γὰρ γράφομεν ταῦτα πάλιν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστάνοντες, or, what comes to the same thing, the more general λέγομεν, γράφομεν, be deduced from συνιστάνομεν; see Mey. in loc. In 1 Pet. ii. 11 ἀπέχεσθε is the reading now adopted, with which in vs. 12 ἔχοντες is regularly connected; and in Acts xxvi. 20 ἀπήγγελλον was long ago substituted for ἀπαγγέλλων. As to Rom. xii. 6 ff.; Heb. viii. 10, and 1 Pet. iii. 1, 7 see § 63. (In Rev. x. 2 ἔχων is subjoined independently and ἐστί can be supplied.)

In Rom. iii. 23 too, πάντες ... ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, δικαιούμενοι δωρεάν etc., the Part. cannot stand for a finite verb (even Ostermann explains it ὑστεροῦνται καὶ δικαιοῦνται), but the Apostle as his words show conceived the connection thus: and come short of the glory of God, in that (since) they are justified freely; the latter is proof of the former.

In 1 Cor. iii. 19 ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν, a quotation from the Old Test., does not form a complete sentence, but contains merely the words suited to the Apostle's purpose, cf. Heb. i. 7. What the Apostle quotes incompletely we ought not to wish to complete by annexing an ἐστί. As to 1 Pet. i. 14, see Fr. Conject. I. 41 sq.; the Part. μὴ συσχηματιζόμενοι may be taken as depending on ἐλπίσατε, or, as
331 I prefer, may be connected with γενήθητε vs. 15 as parallel to κατὰ τὸν
7th ed. καλέσαντα etc. As little reason is there in proverbs, such as 2 Pet. ii. 22 κύων ἐπιστρέψας ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέραμα and ὗς λουσαμένη etc., to change the Part. into the finite verb. The words run: *a dog, that turns to his own vomit*, as if spoken δεικτικῶς in reference to a case under observation; just as we say in German e.g. ein räudiges Schaf! ('a black sheep,' Eng.) when a bad man makes himself conspicuous among the good.

In another way a Part. was taken for a finite verb, when the Part.

[1] Yet it may also be assumed that Peter wished to say: *receiving from God honor and glory — he was declared to be the beloved Son of God*, but interrupts the construction with the direct quotation of the words uttered by the voice from heaven.

seemed to express an action following that denoted by the finite verb (Bähr in Creuzer Melet. III. 50 sq.). In the N. T., however, there is no single established instance of this usage. In Luke iv. 15 ἐδίδασκεν ... 370
δοξαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων means: *he taught being glorified of all*, — while he was glorified of all (during his teaching). Jas. ii. 9 εἰ δὲ προσωπολημπτεῖτε, 316
ἁμαρτίαν ἐργάζεσθε ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου etc. is: *ye commit sin, while* 6th ed.
(*since*) *ye are convicted*, being convicted (as προσωπολημπτοῦντες); Gebser is wrong. In Heb. xi. 35 ἐτυμπανίσθησαν οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν *not accepting the deliverance* (offered them), προσδεξ. denotes something preceding rather than following the τυμπανίζ.; cf. Heb. ix. 12. Acts xix. 29, too, does not contain the use of the Aor. Part. in narration mentioned by Hm. Vig. 774; as ὥρμησάν τε ὁμοθυμαδὸν εἰς τὸ θέατρον, συναρπάσαντες Γάϊον καὶ Ἀρίσταρχον means either, *after they had seized along with themselves* (from their quarters) or, *while they seized along with them.* In Luke i. 9 ἔλαχεν τοῦ θυμιᾶσαι εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου, the Part. probably belongs to the Inf. (as the Vulgate takes it): entering into the temple to burn incense; Mey. is artificial. As to Rom. iii. 23, see above, p. 352. Rom. ii. 4 requires no elucidation. Likewise the peculiarity occasionally found in Greek authors, according to which the principal notion is expressed by a Part. and the secondary by a finite verb (Mtth. 1295 f.; Hm. Soph. Aj. 172; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 136), has by some been unwarrantably forced upon the N. T.; such critics having quite forgotten that the usage in question could not occur independently of any limitation involved in the nature of the ideas to be expressed. To explain 2 Cor. v. 2 στενάζομεν ... ἐπιποθοῦντες as put for ἐπιποθοῦμεν στενάζοντες is eminently infelicitous; the Part. must be regarded as subjoined to the verb, and explained as causal like στενάζομεν βαρούμενοι in vs. 4.

7. The Present Part. (with the Article) is often used substantively, and then, as a noun, excludes all indication of time. In Eph. iv. 28 ὁ κλέπτων μηκέτι κλεπτέτω is not for ὁ κλέψας (as some Codd. have); but, *let the stealer* i.e. *the thief steal no more*, Heb. xi. 28. So also when it is accompanied with an Acc. of the Object, or other adjuncts; as, Gal. i. 23 ὁ διώκων ἡμᾶς ποτέ *our former persecutor*, Matt. xxvii. 40 ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναόν *the destroyer of the temple* (in his imagination), Rev. xv. 2 οἱ νικῶντες ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου (which Eichhorn, Einl. N. T. II. 378, mentions as singular!), xx. 10; Gal. ii. 2 (οἱ δοκοῦντες see Kypke II. 274; cf. also Pachym. 332
I. 117, 138, etc.); 1 Thess. i. 10; v. 24; 1 Pet. i. 17; Rom. v. 17; 7th ed.
Jno. xii. 20 (xiii. 11); cf. Soph. Antig. 239 οὔτ' εἶδον ὅστις ἦν ὁ δρῶν, Paus. 9, 25, 5 ὁποῖά ἐστιν αὐτοῖς καὶ τῇ μητρὶ τὰ δρώμενα, Diog. L. 1, 87 βραδέως ἐγχείρει τοῖς πραττομένοις (faciendis), Soph. Electr. 200 ὁ ταῦτα πράσσων, Plat. Cratyl. 416 b. ὁ τὰ ὀνόματα τιθείς, Demosth. Theocrin. 508 b. and frequently in the orators

ὁ τὸν νόμον τιθείς (legislator), ὁ γράφων τὴν μαρτυρίαν (Bremi, Demosth. p. 72) Strabo 15, 713; Arrian. Al. 5, 7, 12; Poppo, Thuc.
371 I. I. 152; Schaef. Eurip. Orest. p. 70; Demosth. V. 120, 127; poet. gnom. 228 sq., and Plutarch. V. 211 sq.; Weber, Demosth. 180; Bornem. Schol. p. 10; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 22; Maetzner ad Antiphont. p. 182. Likewise in Acts iii. 2 οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι is used substantively, *those entering;* one cannot regard it with Kühnöl
217 (Matt. p. 324), on the ground that μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι occurs in
3th ed. vs. 3, as the Present Part. used for the Fut. The more precise expression is quite appropriate in vs. 3, as the person addressing the two apostles detained them a short time during their εἰσιέναι. (In other passages, when there is a distinct reference to past time, the Aorist Part. is used substantively; as, Jno. v. 29; Acts ix. 21; 2 Cor. vii. 12, etc., cf. ὁ ἐκείνου τεκών Eurip. Electr. 335, οἱ τῶν ἰόντων τεκόντες Aeschyl. Pers. 245,— Aristoph. eccl. 1126 ἡ ἐμὴ κεκτημένη, Lucian. Tim. 56.)

Such Present Participles with the Article show themselves to be complete substantives when a Genitive is joined to them, as in 1 Cor. vii. 35 πρὸς τὸ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν συμφέρον (Demosth. cor. 316 c. τὰ μικρὰ συμφέροντα τῆς πόλεως); see Lob. Soph. Aj. 238 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. p. 252.

8. In quotations from the Old Test. a Part. is occasionally connected with some person of the *same* verb (and placed before it); as, Acts vii. 34 ἰδὼν εἶδον from Exod. iii. 7 (cf. Lucian. dial. mar. 4, 3), Heb. vi. 14 εὐλογῶν εὐλογήσω σε καὶ πληθύνων πληθυνῶ σε (from Gen. xxii. 17), Matt. xiii. 14 βλέποντες βλέψετε (from Isa. vi. 9). This construction is extremely frequent in the Sept., as Judges i. 28; iv. 9; vii. 19; xi. 25; xv. 16; Gen. xxvi. 28; xxxvii. 8, 10; xliii. 6; Exod. iii. 7; 1 Sam. i. 10; iii. 21; xiv. 28; 1 Kings xi. 11; Job vi. 2; Ruth ii. 16; 1 Macc. v. 40; Judith ii. 13 (see Thiersch p. 164 sqq.), and is a Hellenizing of the Hebrew Inf. Absolute (Ewald, krit. Gr. 560 ff.), though the LXX, once accustomed to the construction, sometimes employ it even where the Hebrew contains no Inf. Absol., as in Exod. xxiii. 26. This mode of expression, however, was judiciously chosen, although in Greek prose, with the exception of that isolated ἰδὼν εἶδον in Lucian, no perfectly satisfactory parallels can be shown (Georgi, vind. p. 196 sq. has mixed together things dissimilar);[1] for in the instances

[1] Some passages have been quoted according to erroneous readings. Plat. Tim. 30 c. runs thus: τίνι τῶν ζώων αὐτὸν εἰς ὁμοιότητα ὀ ξυνιστὰς ξυνίστησε. Likewise Plat. Lach. 185 d. σκοπούμενοι σκοποῦμεν is questioned by recent critics, and *Mtth.* 1301 proposes to read: σκοποῦμεν ἃ σκοποῦμεν. Yet the singularity here consists more in the connection of the Middle and Active.

apparently corresponding the Part. carries its own idea, as in Her. 5, 95 *φεύγων ἐκφεύγει* fuga evadit (Diod. Sic. 17, 83), and still more in Xen. Cyr. 8, 4, 9 *ὑπακούων σχολῇ ὑπήκουσα*,[1] Lucian. parasit. 43 *φεύγων ἐκεῖθεν . . . εἰς τ. Ταυρέου παλαίστραν κατέφυγε*, see Gataker de stylo c. 9;[2] Lob. paralip. p. 522. The later writers are the first to imitate this construction, as Anna Alex. 3, 80; Euseb. H. E. 6, 45. Originally this Participle implied an emphasis, though subsequently it may have become weakened. In the three passages quoted above, this emphasis is perceptible. We express it by the voice and the position of the words, or by a corresponding abverb, etc.: *well have I seen, — surely* (richly?) *will I bless thee, — with your own eyes shall ye see*, etc. Acts xiii. 45 is a construction of another sort: *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀντέλεγον τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου λεγομένοις, ἀντιλέγοντες καὶ βλασφημοῦντες*, where *ἀντέλεγον* is taken up again in the Part. and strengthened by *βλασφ.*

333 7th ed. 372 318 6th ed

Eph. v. 5 *τοῦτο ἴστε γινώσκοντες* probably does not come under this head, but *ἴστε* refers to what is stated in vs. 3 f., and *γινώσκ.* is construed with *ὅτι*: this, however, ye know, aware (considering) that, etc. That 1 Pet. i. 10, 12; Acts v. 4 do not come under this rule, is obvious to every one. Finally, it passes comprehension that Kühnöl should adduce Heb. x. 37 *ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἥξει* (he omits, it is true, the Article) as an instance of the above usage.

Note 1. On Participles used absolutely, see § 59. Such is also *τυχόν*, 1 Cor. xvi. 6, which is inserted in the clause as an adverb, Xen. A. 6, 1, 20; Plato, Alcib. 2, 140, etc.

Note 2. Sometimes two finite verbs are so closely connected by *καὶ*, that the first has, logically, the force of a Part., e.g. Matt. xviii. 21 *ποσάκις ἁμαρτήσει εἰς ἐμὲ ὁ ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτῷ*, i.e. *ἁμαρτήσαντι τῷ ἀδελφῷ*. This distribution of a single (logical) clause into two grammatical clauses is a peculiarity of Oriental diction, and is of frequent occurrence; see § 66, 7.

Note 3. Luke and Paul (still more, however, the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews) are peculiarly fond of participial constructions. Paul accumulates Part. on Part.; cf. 1 Thess. ii. 15 f.; Tit. ii. 12, 13; 2 Cor. iv. 8–10. In narration, however, the use of Participles appears on the whole less frequent and less diversified in the N. T. than in Greek historical authors. The historical discourse of the N. T. runs on in simple

[1] It is hardly necessary to remark that the phrase *ἰδὼν οἶδα* (scio me vidisse) Athen. 6, 226; Arrian. Ind. 4, 15 does not come under this head. Cf. also *ἀκούσας οἶδα* Lucian. dial. mort. 28, 1.

[2] This author has rightly set aside the passage from Aeschyl. Prom. 447. But he found himself finally compelled to let the instance from Lucian. dial. mar. stand. Accordingly, viewed *linguistically*, it approximates the Hebrew mode of expression, a fact which *Thiersch* should not have questioned.

334 clauses (which are joined together especially by the oft-recurring καί)
7th ed. and disdains the periodic structure in which the Greeks were so expert.
Yet cf. Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. p. 465.

---

373 # CHAPTER V.

THE PARTICLES.

§ 46. THE PARTICLES IN GENERAL.

1. Although propositions and periods can be formed by means of those inflections of the noun and verb whose syntax has been discussed in the preceding pages — (propositions, in particular, by
319 means of Cases, the use of which is so varied in Greek; periods,
6th ed. by means of Infinitives, Participles, etc.) — yet those inflections alone do not suffice for the great diversity of relations which give origin to propositions and periods. Hence language possesses besides a vast stock of so-called *particles*, by whose aid it becomes possible to construct all conceivable propositions and all their conceivable combinations. Particles are divided, as is well-known, into Prepositions, Adverbs, and Conjunctions (Rost S. 717); though respecting the boundary-lines which separate these three species from each other, grammarians have not yet been able to agree. Cf., in particular, Hm. emend. rat. p. 149 ff.

Interjections are not words, but sounds; and lie quite beyond the limits of Syntax, and indeed of Grammar.

2. Without attempting to settle the dispute among grammarians respecting the boundaries of these three classes of particles, we see at once as much as this:

1) That the classification must be made not on the basis of the words but of their signification; as it has long been acknowledged that prepositions e.g. often assume the nature of adverbs, and vice versâ (Hm. as above, p. 161), — in fact, that the prepositions are adverbs originally.

2) That all particles either serve merely to complete the structure of a simple proposition and confine their import within its
374 limits, or are designed to join one proposition to another. The latter are properly called *Conjunctions;* and if the grammarian

pays regard to the language (expressed thought) rather than to the (pure) thought, he may reckon among them the comparative particle ὡς (ὥσπερ), the particles of time (ἐπεί, ὅτε, ὁπότε, etc.), the negative particle of design μή etc., so far forth as they are also 335
connectives; so that these particles, according to their import, 7th ed.
may be classed either as adverbs or as conjunctions. The power of adverbs and prepositions, however, is confined to the limits of a simple proposition; the structure of this they serve to complete. Prepositions denote only *relations* (of substantives); adverbs, *inherent attributes* (of terms of quality or condition, and consequently of adjectives and verbs, inasmuch as the latter are compounded of the copula and a term of quality or condition). See, especially, Hm., as above, 152 ff.

We shall perhaps never succeed in effecting a thoroughly satisfactory classification of the particles, since in this matter language practically does not coincide perfectly with the philosophical method of pure theory. Much light is shed on the relation of particles to the structure of sentences by Grotefend, Grundzüge einer neuen Satztheorie. Hannover, 1827. 8vo.; Krüger, Erörterung der grammat. Eintheilung und grammat. Verhältn. der Sätze. Frft. a. M. 1826. 8vo. Cf. also Werner in the n. Jahrb. f. Philol. 1834. p. 85 ff.

3. The great copiousness of the Greek language in particles, as 320
developed in the elegant literary Attic, is shared by the N. T. dic- 6th ed.
tion to but a limited extent; for not only was the (later) popular language of the Greeks in general more frugal in the use of particles, but the N. T. authors also, as they imparted a Jewish tinge to their presentations of thought, did not feel impelled to employ the niceties of Greek composition in the structure of periods. From the nature of the case, however, while they could easily dispense with the great variety of conjunctions, they could least dispense with the prepositions. In treating of particles, N. T. Grammar, if it will avoid encroaching on the department of Lexicography, should not take up the particles separately and explain in detail all their various significations, but should endeavor rather, primarily to give only a clear and discriminating delineation of the various modifications of thought which the particles are employed to designate; and then in every instance to point out *how far* these varieties of meaning have been expressed by the N. T. writers through the use of the abundant store of particles which the Greek language supplied. At the same time, however, it will take pains to exhibit in its leading traits, so far as the exist-

ing state of N. T. Lexicography and Interpretation may permit, the mutual dependence of the significations of the principal parti-
375 cles, and emphatically to protest against the arbitrariness of what is called *enallage particularum*.

The general subject of the Greek particles had never been in any considerable degree exhaustively treated even down to quite recent times, either as respects the facts (especially in reference to the various periods
336 of the language) or still less as respects their philosophy. The works of
7th ed. Mt. Devarius (Reusmann's edition, Lips. 1793. 8vo.) and H. Hoogeveen (Amsterd. 1769. II. 4to. condensed by Schütz, Lips. 1806. 8vo.) are no longer satisfactory, especially as they entirely omit the prepositions. On the other hand, J. A. Hartung, Lehre v. d. Partikeln der griech. Spr. Erlang. 1832 f. II. 8vo. merits recognition. Still more helpful are the acute researches with which R. Klotz has enriched his edition of Devarius (Lips. 1835. 1842. II. 8vo.); [cf. also W. Bäumlein, Untersuchung üb. griech. Partikeln. Stuttg. 1861. 8vo.]. Schraut, on the other hand, die griech. Partikeln im Zusammenhange mit den ältesten Stämmen der Sprache (Neuss, 1848), is too fanciful. A comparative treatment is given by E. A. Fritsch, vergleich. Bearbeit. d. griech. u. lat. Partikeln. Giessen, 1856. 8vo. For the biblical particles a Lexicon Particularum to the Sept. and the Apocrypha is a desideratum, as the concordances and Schleusner also in his Thesaur. Philol. have entirely omitted these words. (Bruder, as is well known, has carefully inserted the particles in his N. T. Concordance.) Tittmann's treatise on N. T. Particles (de usu particular. N. T. Cap. 1, 2, Lips. 1831. II. 4to., also in his Synonym. N. T. II. 42 sqq.) is not thoroughly to be commended; moreover it was interrupted by the death of the acute and learned author, who however did not pay due attention to the actual usage of the language.

321 § 47. THE PREPOSITIONS IN GENERAL,[1] AND SUCH AS GOVERN THE GENITIVE IN PARTICULAR.
6th ed.

1. The prepositions correspond to the cases; hence each according to its signification is connected with a particular case, viz. with that case whose primary meaning accords with the primary meaning of the preposition. Prepositions are employed where the cases are insufficient to indicate a relation (for these relations are extremely diversified), and sometimes also where a case would
376 have sufficed indeed, but on account of the variety of its uses did

[1] Cf. *Hm.* de emend. rat. p. 161 sqq ; *B. G. Weiske,* de praeposition. gr. comment. Gorlic. 1809 f.; *K. G. Schmidt,* quaestion. grammat. de praeposition. gr. Berol. 1829. 8vo.; *Döderlein,* Reden u. Aufs. II. nr. 3; *Bhdy.* S. 195 ff.; *Schneider,* Vorles. S. 181 ff.

not appear to the speaker to be definite enough for his purpose. They are relatively more numerous in the N. T. than in Greek prose, because the apostles had not such an inherent sense as cultivated native Greeks of the extended application of the cases; besides, the Oriental prefers the more vivid expression; and moreover, the Hebrew-Aramaic language indicates by means of prepositions nearly all those relations which are designated in Greek by cases alone.

2. In treating of prepositions it is necessary, in the first place, 337
to seize with clearness and precision the true primary meaning of 7th ed
each from which all its applications emanate as from a common centre, and to trace back to this all the various shades of meaning the preposition may have assumed, — i.e. to show how the transition to every such application was effected in the mind of the speaker or writer; and secondly, to take cognizance of the case, and the necessity for it, which is joined to a given preposition, either in general or in a particular range of significations (Bernhardi, allg. Sprachl. I. 164 f.), and in turn to make use of this knowledge in fixing the limits of the signification of the prepositions themselves. The former, viz. the determination of the primary meaning of the prepositions as exhibited now in their construction with the Gen. now with the Dat. etc., will set in its true light the mutual interchange of prepositions, which in the N. T. has been thought to be wholly unlimited. The latter must be performed without a passion for over-strained refinements, and with a recognition at the outset of the fact that, according to the special, and according to the more or less precise, perception of a relation to be expressed (particularly if mental), one and the same preposition may be construed with several different cases (cf. Hm. emend. rat. 163).

In treating of prepositions in the N. T., it is only necessary to add first, a notice of how far later Greek, and in particular the popular language, extended the use and import of prepositions, obliterated their nicer distinctions, and was led probably even into 322
improprieties in employing them; further, to pay constant regard 6.h ed
to the Hebrew-Aramaic, which delights in the use of prepositions and presents numerous relations under aspects different from the Greek (cf. e.g. *ὁμόσαι ἔν τινι*, *ἀποκτείνειν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ*); and finally, not to leave out of sight the distinctively Christian view which 377
underlies the use of many prepositions (e.g. *ἐν Χριστῷ* or *κυρίῳ*).

The maltreatment of the prepositions until a few decades ago on the

part of N. T. philologists in Lexicons and Commentaries (e.g. Koppe's N. T.) was really horrible;[1] but it found precedent and support in the purely empirical treatment of the Hebrew prepositions current until Ewald's time, see my exeget. Stud. I. 27 ff. Wahl was the first to pursue a better course; and almost everybody now has begun to be ashamed of the license just described.

As respects in particular the comparative predominance of the Greek element and of the Hebrew-Aramaic in the use of the prepositions, it must not be overlooked, 1) that many constructions which the N. T. writers adopted through the influence of their mother tongue, occur also in Greek poets and later prose writers, so diversified is the use of the Greek prepo-
338 sitions; 2) that though in the more Hebraistic portions of the N. T.
7th ed. (particularly in the Revelation) the exposition from the Hebrew suggests itself, yet we must not on that account explain the Greek prepositions in all the books indiscriminately by a reference to the Hebrew; for simultaneously with the Greek prepositions a multitude of special linguistic relations had been communicated to the Apostles, and close observation shows that as respects the relations expressed by prepositions the Apostles had already become accustomed to think *in Greek;* 3) that, especially in Paul (and John), the un-Hellenic application of several prepositions (e.g. ἐν) is closely connected with *doctrinal* phraseology, and belongs to the Apostolic (Christian) element in N. T. diction.

3. The *proper* and the *metaphorical* significations of each preposition must be accurately distinguished. The former always refer primarily to *local* relations (Bernhardi I. 290); and if these are conceived in great multiplicity by a nation, a corresponding multiplicity of prepositions is the result. The simple relations of place are but two, — that of rest and that of motion (or even merely of direction, which is viewed as more or less a motion). The latter, however, comprises motion *towards* and motion *from*. The notion of rest is denoted by the Dative; that of motion *towards*, by the Accusative; that of motion *from*, by the Genitive.

323 *Local* designations to which single prepositions correspond are,
6th ed. a) of rest: *in* ἐν, *by the side of* παρά, *upon* ἐπί, *over* ὑπέρ, *under*
378 (ὑπό), *amid* (*with*) μετά, *before* πρό, *behind* μετά, *on* (*up on*) ἀνά, *about* ἀμφί, *around* περί, *over against* ἀντί; b) of (direction) motion *towards* a point: *into* εἰς, *towards* κατά, *to* πρός, *upon* ἐπί, *to beside* παρά, *under* ὑπό; c) of (direction) motion *from*: *out of* ἐκ, *from* ἀπό, *from under* ὑπό, *down from* κατά, *from beside* παρά. To the last division may be referred *through* relating to space (διά)

[1] *Tittmann,* de scriptor. N. T. diligentia gramm. p. 12 (Synon. I. 207): nulla est, ne repugnans quidem significatio, quin quaecunque praepositio eam in N. T. habere dicatur.

(cf. Progr. de verbor. cum praeposs. compositor. in N. T. usu V. p. 3), for which the Hebrew uses מִן, and the German sometimes *aus* (e.g. *aus* dem Thore gehen).

4. Language deals at first with the ideas of *time* by taking local relations as the pattern; hence temporal senses also are put upon most of the prepositions. Not till later does the transition ensue to immaterial, purely ideal relations, which every nation conceives under forms more or less material. This produces a corresponding diversity in national modes of expression. A Greek, for instance, says, λέγειν περί τινος; a Roman, dicere *de* aliqua re; a Hebrew, דִּבֶּר בְּ; a German, *über* etwas sprechen. The first views the object as a central point which the speaker as it were *encom-* 339
passes (to speak *about* a thing); the Roman, as a whole of which 7th ed.
the speaker imparts something to the hearer (*de* as it were to speak off something from the object);[1] the Hebrew, as the ground on which the speaker stands (to speak *on* something); the German, as something lying before the speaker *over* which his discourse extends (for über governs in this connection the Accusative).

The notion of *origin*, and consequently of *cause*, is most naturally implied in the prepositions from, out of (ἀπό, ὑπό, παρά, ἐκ); that of *occasion*, and consequently also of *motive*, in πρός, εἰς (e.g. *on* the report), ἐπί with the Dat. and διά with the Acc. (on account of). Here ἐπί refers to the basis on which something rests; hence we also use the word *ground* for *reason*. *Design* and *aim* expressed by *to* are denoted by ἐπί with the Dat., or by εἰς or πρός with the Acc. *Condition* is expressed by ἐπί with the Dat., just as we say by a 379
similar metaphor: *auf* Lohn Recht sprechen. The *object* which underlies an emotion is indicated by ἐπί with the Gen., as in German sich freuen *über* (rejoice *over*), stolz sein *auf* (pride one's self *on*). To speak in reference to an object is λέγειν περί τινος (see above). The *rule*, or standard, is expressed either by *after* (πρός, κατά) or by *from* (ἐκ); in the former construction, the rule is conceived as something *after*, *according to*, which a thing is to shape itself; in the latter, as that *from* which the thing regulated is derived. Lastly, the *means* finds natural expression in διά with the Gen., 324
sometimes in ἐν. 6th ed.

5. One preposition may sometimes, no doubt, be employed for another; but we must deduct from instances of this class all those in which an immaterial relation may be expressed with equal pro-

[1] As to the primary import of the Latin *de*, see *Heidtmann* in the Zeitschr. f. Alterth. Wiss. 1846. no. 109 f.

priety by several different prepositions,[1] (loqui *de re* and *super re*, ζῆν ἔκ and ἀπό τινος, ὠφελεῖσθαι ἀπό and ἔκ τ. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 34; Mem. 2, 4, 1, also ἐπί τινι, ἀποκτείνεσθαι ἀπό and ἔκ τινος Rev. ix. 18, ἀποθνήσκειν ἔκ τινος Rev. viii. 11 and ὑπό τ., ἀποθνήσκειν ὑπέρ and περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, ἀγωνίζεσθαι περί and ὑπέρ τινος, ἐκλέγεσθαι ἀπὸ
340 and ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν).[2] This cannot be called *enallage* of prepositions. On the other hand, particularly in expressing *local* relations, the more comprehensive preposition may be used for the more restricted, (as Luke xxiv. 2 ἀποκυλίζειν τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, but Mark xvi. 3 ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου; the latter agrees better with the precise facts of the case: *out of* the door — cut into the rock). This is sometimes attributable to the fact that it does not seem to be everywhere necessary to speak with entire precision, sometimes the author may through negligence have used the more indefinite term for the more definite. The interchange of prepositions is only apparent when any of them is employed *praegnanter*, i.e. when it includes also a second relation, the antecedent or con-
380 sequent of that which it strictly expresses, as κατοικεῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν, εἶναι ὑπὸ νόμον; or in case of an attraction, as αἴρειν τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας Matt. xxiv. 17, ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον Luke ix. 61.

7th ed.

An arbitrary interchange of prepositions — (of which the earlier N. T. commentaries are full, and which was upheld in part by an abuse of parallel passages, especially in the gospels) — would never have entered the imagination of critics, had they been accustomed to consider language as a *living* instrument of social intercourse. It is really preposterous to suppose that any one could have said, 'he is travelling *to* Egypt' for 'he is travelling *in* Egypt' (εἰς for ἐν); or, 'all is *for* him' instead of 'all is *from* him.' In expressing *by*, for instance, διά and ἐν are not thoroughly equivalent to each other, particularly διὰ Ἰ. Χριστοῦ and ἐν Ἰ. Χριστῷ. In Latin, also, *per* (before names of persons) and the Ablative (of things) are usually distinguished. Close observation shows in general how correctly the N. T. writers discriminate between those prepositions even which

[1] Thus Paul sometimes employs different prepositions in parallel clauses, to give variety to his discourse; as, Rom. iii. 30 ὃς δικαιώσει περιτομὴν ἐκ πίστεως καὶ ἀκροβυστίαν διὰ τῆς πίστεως, Eph. iii. 8 f.

[2] Sometimes in different languages the same relation, because viewed under different aspects, is expressed by prepositions of exactly opposite significations. Thus Germans say, *zur* Rechten; the Romans, Greeks, and Hebrews, *a* dextra etc. Even one and the same language may express a relation, especially if ideal, by opposite prepositions. We say *on* the condition and *under* the condition. In South Germany they say, relation or friend *to* (zu) one; in Saxony, relation or friend *of* (von) one. How ridiculous it would be to infer from such instances, that *of* (von) is sometimes equivalent to *to* (zu), and *on* to *under*!

are closely allied (e.g. Rom. xiii. 1 οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ, αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν).[1] And we ought to honor them and ourselves by recognizing everywhere their scrupulous care. 325 6th ed.

Where either of two prepositions might be employed with equal propriety, a preference for *one* in the N. T. is perhaps to be attributed to the Hellenistic tinge of its diction; this, at least, the critic must take into consideration as a possibility. Planck, however (articuli nonnulli Lex. nov. in N. T. Goett. 1824. 4to. p. 14), is mistaken in supposing that ἀγαθὸς πρός τι (Eph. iv. 29) is less correct Greek than εἴς τι. The former construction is of frequent occurrence, e.g. Theophr. hist. plant. 4, 3, 1 and 7; 9, 13, 3; Xen. Mem. 4, 6, 10, etc.; see Schneider, Plat. civ. II. 278.

With such prepositions as in different significations govern different cases, it is sometimes possible, when *immaterial* relations are to be expressed, to use either of two cases with equal correctness (as ἐπί with Gen. or Acc.). Sometimes the Codd. vary between the two; see Rom. viii. 11. In the N. T. this has been erroneously said to hold frequently in reference to διά; see below, § 47, i, d. p. 381, cf. § 49 c. Purely external relations, on the contrary, sustain no such interchange in careful writers; only very late, especially the Byzantine, authors indulge in it, and confound e.g. μετά with the Gen. and with the Acc.; see the word in the Index to Malalas in the Bonn ed., cf. Schaef. Ind. ad Aesop. p. 136; Boisson. Anecd. IV. 487; V. 84.[2] Indeed the later writers have already become so devoid of an appreciation of the cases as to begin to connect prepositions even with cases altogether foreign to them, — ἀπό, for instance, with Acc. and Dat., κατά with Dat., σύν with Gen.; see Index to Leo Gramm. and Theophan.[3] 341 7th ed. 381

The attempt, recently revived, to explain this alleged interchange of cases in the N. T. by the circumstance that Hebrew has no cases, is to be rejected, if for no other reason, because apart from a very small number of doubtful exceptions the N. T. writers exhibit a correct perception of the differences between the cases.

The position of prepositions is more simple in the N. T. than in the classics, Mtth. II. 1399 f. They are uniformly placed immediately before the noun, and only those conjunctions which never stand at the beginning of a clause intervene between preposition and substantive; as, δέ Matt. xi. 12; xxii. 31; xxiv. 22, 36; Acts v. 12, γάρ Jno. iv. 37; v. 46; Acts viii. 23; Rom iii. 20, τε Acts x. 39; xxv. 24, γε Luke xi. 8; xviii. 5, μέν and μὲν γάρ Rom. xi. 22; Acts xxviii. 22; 2 Tim. iv. 4.

[1] Hence I cannot admit what *Lücke*, Apokal. II. 458, says about an irregular and inconsistent use of prepositions in the N. T.

[2] In close succession μετά signifying *with* takes the Acc. and then the Gen. in Acta apocryph. p. 257.

[3] The case is different with ἐν followed by the Acc.; see *Schaef.* Dion. comp. p. 305; *Ross*, inscriptt. gr. I. 37.

326 6th ed.

PREPOSITIONS WITH THE GENITIVE.

a. Ἀντί (Lat. *ante*), of which the local meaning is (directly) *before, in front of, over-against*, denotes figuratively barter, exchange (Plato, conv. 218 e.), in which one thing is given *for*, *instead of*, another (tooth *for* tooth, Matt. v. 38), and in consequence assumes its place. It governs the Genitive, that being the case of (issuing from and) exchange (see above, p. 206), e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 15 ἡ κόμη ἀντὶ περιβολαίου δέδοται (τῇ γυναικί) her hair *for*, instead of, a covering (to serve her as a covering, cf. Lucian. philops. 22; Liban. ep. 350), Heb. xii. 16 ὃς ἀντὶ βρώσεως μιᾶς ἀπέδοτο τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτοῦ, vs. 2 ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς ὑπέμεινε σταυρόν (*for* the joy that was set before him, *against* this setting death on the cross), Matt. xx. 28 δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, xvii. 27 ἐκεῖνον (στατῆρα) λαβὼν δὸς αὐτοῖς ἀντὶ ἐμοῦ καὶ σοῦ, ii. 22 Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεύει ἀντὶ Ἡρῴδου *in place of* Herod, cf.
342 Her. 1, 108; Xen. A. 1, 1, 4; 1 Kings xi. 44. Hence ἀντί is the
7th ed. preposition chiefly used to denote *the price for*, *in exchange for*, which one gives or receives an article of merchandise (Heb.
382 xii. 16); then, to denote requital (Lev. xxiv. 20) and *reward* (bordering on the causal sense, like the Germ. ob) e.g. ἀνθ' ὧν (as a recompense) *for this* (*that*), i.e. *because*, Luke i. 20; xix. 44; Plat. Menex. 244; Xen. A. 5, 5, 14; 1 Kings xi. 11; Joel iii. 5; or *on which account* (wherefore) Luke xii. 3; ἀντὶ τούτου Eph. v. 31 (Sept.) *therefore, for this*, cf. Pausan. 10, 38, 5. Ἀντί is used in Jno. i. 16 ἐλάβομεν . . . χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος in a peculiar application, referable, however, to its primary import: grace *over*, upon, grace (Theogn. sent. 344 ἀντ' ἀνιῶν ἀνίας), strictly grace *against*, *for*, grace, grace *in the place of* that which preceded, therefore grace uninterrupted, unceasingly renewed.

b. Ἀπό, ἐκ, παρά, and ὑπό, all denote *issuing*, *proceeding from* — the generic import of the Genitive — but with some diversity as respects the previous mutual relation of the objects in question. Beyond doubt ἐκ indicates the closest connection; ὑπό, one less close; παρά (de chez moi, מֵעִם), and especially ἀπό,[1] one still more distant. Accordingly, these prepositions may be ranged in

[1] The distinction between ἀπό and ἐκ is perceptible in Luke ii. 4 (cf. also Acts xxiii. 34); but in Jno. xi. 1 (see *Lücke* in loc.) and Rev. ix. 18 ἀπό and ἐκ are employed as synonymous. Cf. also Luke xxi. 18 with Acts xxvii. 34. On the other hand, in the parallel passages Mark xvi. 3 and Luke xxiv. 2 ἀπό and ἐκ are respectively used, — *out of* the door, the more precise (and suitable) expression, and (away) *from* the sepulchre, the more loose; see p. 362.

the following order, proceeding from the most intimate connection to the more remote: ἐκ, ὑπό, παρά, ἀπό. Further, if merely the idea of *proceeding from* is to be expressed, ἀπό is used. If the proceeding is definitely thought of as from *a person*, παρά or ὑπό is required. If the person is to be indicated only in a general way as the point of departure, παρά is used; if represented strictly as the efficient, producing cause, ὑπό is selected, and hence is the 327
regular preposition after passives. Finally, the idea of *distance* 6th ed.
and *separation* attaches itself to ἀπό; so that both ἀπό and ἐκ express *disjoining* and *removal*, while these notions are not directly implied by παρά and ὑπό.

Παρά is used properly in reference to objects proceeding from one's *vicinity or sphere of power* (παρά with Gen. used antithetically to πρός with Acc. in Lucian. Tim. 53), e.g. Mark xiv. 43 παραγίνεται ὄχλος πολὺς . . . παρὰ τῶν ἀρχιερέων *from the chief priests* (near whom, about whom, they served; cf. Lucian. philops. 5; Demosth. Polycl. 710 b.), xii. 2 ἵνα παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ part of the produce which was *in the hands of the husbandmen;* Jno. xvi. 27 ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον (cf. i. 1 ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν), v. 41 (Plat. rep. 10, 612 d.); xv. 26; 343
Eph. vi. 8; Luke ii. 1; 2 Pet. i. 17. Accordingly, it is joined to 7th ed.
verbs of *inquiring* and *asking* Matt. ii. 4, 16; Mark viii. 11; Jno. 383
iv. 9, of *learning* 2 Tim. iii. 14; Acts xxiv. 8 (Xen. C. 2, 2, 6; Plat. Euth. 12 e.), the matter to be learned etc. being viewed as in some one's (mental) possession (ἀπό Mark xv. 45; Gal. iii. 2 expressing this more indefinitely; ἔκ τινος Xen. Oec. 13, 6 with greater precision). It is only in later writers that παρά is used after Passive verbs as exactly equivalent to ὑπό (Bast, ep. crit. p. 156, 235; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. II. 172). In Acts xxii. 30 τι κατηγορεῖται παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Luke could hardly have said ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων (they had as yet laid no formal charge, had not yet taken measures for a regular prosecution), the meaning is: of what he is accused *on the part of* the Jews. Matt. xxi. 42 παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη (Sept.) means: this is from the Lord (*divinitus*, through means under God's control); and Jno. i. 6 ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ θεοῦ: he made his appearance, sent from God, cf. vs. 1 ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

In no passage of the N. T. do we find παρά with Gen. used for παρά with Dat., as is sometimes assumed in Greek authors (Schaef. Dion. comp. p. 118 sq.; Held, Plut. Tim. p. 427). In 2 Tim. i. 18 εὑρίσκειν implies the notion of *procuring;* (otherwise in Luke i. 30 εὗρες χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ

with God.) Mark v. 26 is to be explained by attraction; probably, however, in iii. 21 οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ are *his kindred* (those descended *from him*, those belonging to him), see Fr. in loc. cf. Susann. 33. As to παρά in a circumlocution for the Gen. see § 30, 3, note 5. That τὰ παρ' ὑμῶν Phil. iv. 18, and τὰ παρ' αὐτῶν Luke x. 7, are not strictly equivalent to τὰ ὑμῶν (ὑμέτερα), αὐτῶν, is obvious; in both passages the phrase is accompanied by a verb of receiving (having received the things sent from you i.e. your presents; eating what is set before you from (by) them).

Ἐκ originally denotes issuing *from within* (the compass, sphere, of) something (antithetic to εἰς Luke x. 7; xvii. 24; Herod. 4, 15, 10; Aesch. dial. 3, 11), e.g. Luke vi. 42 ἔκβαλε τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ (it was ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ), Matt. viii. 28 ἐκ τῶν μνημείων
328 ἐξερχόμενοι, Acts ix. 3 περιήστραψεν αὐτὸν φῶς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,
6th ed. Matt. i. 16 ἐξ ἧς (Μαρίας) ἐγεννήθη Ἰησοῦς, vs. 3; 1 Pet. i. 23. Concisely in Luke v. 3 ἐδίδασκεν ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου *out of the ship* (speaking from on board) cf. ii. 35. Allied to this is the use of ἐκ to denote the *material out of which* a thing is made, Matt. xxvii. 29; Rom. ix. 21; cf. Herod. 8, 4, 27; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 150; then, the *mass* or *store out of* which a thing is taken, Jno.
384 vi. 50 φαγεῖν ἐξ ἄρτου, Luke viii. 3; 1 Jno. iv. 13 ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν *he hath given us of his Spirit;* further, the *class* to which one belongs, (*out*) *of* which one is, Jno. vii. 48 μή τις ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπίστευσεν; iii. 1 ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, xvi. 17 εἶπον ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν (τινες), 2 Tim. iii. 6; 2 Jno. 4; Rev. ii. 10,
344 or the *country from* which one derived his origin, Acts xxiii. 34,
7th ed. the *progenitor* from whom one is descended, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων (Plato, Phaedr. 246 a., cf. δουλέκδουλος D.S. exc. Vat. p. 31), cf. Heb. ii. 11; lastly, the *situation, state* out of which one comes, Rev. ix. 20, or (by brachylogy) *out of* which he undertakes something, 2 Cor. ii. 4 ἐκ πολλῆς θλίψεως ... ἔγραψα ὑμῖν. Sometimes ἐκ is used in a local sense, like the Latin *ex* for *de* (*down from*), Acts xxviii. 4 κρεμάμενον τὸ θηρίον ἐκ τῆς χειρός (Judith viii. 24; xiv. 11; Odyss. 8, 67; Her. 4, 10; Xen. M. 3, 10, 13), Acts xxvii. 29, or, with less precision,[1] Heb. xiii. 10 φαγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου *from the altar* (what was laid as an offering *upon* the altar);[2]

[1] Mark xvi. 3 does not come under this head: see above, no. 5, p. 362. Besides, it must not be forgotten that the same relation may be conceived somewhat differently in different languages, and yet with equal propriety: e.g. Rom. xiii. 11 ἐγερθῆναι ἐξ ὕπνου, (aufstehen *vom* Schlafe) arise *out of, from,* sleep. In Rev. vi. 14 ἐκ is probably used designedly, as the mountains are rooted in the earth. It is certainly so used in Jno. xx. 1.

[2] In the N. T. καταβαίνειν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους is unique, Matt. xvii 9 (Exod. xix. 14;

sometimes it denotes mere direction, *from*, Matt. xx. 21 *ἵνα καθίσωσιν ... εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν* etc., Heb. i. 13 (Bleek in loc.), where the Germ. says *on (to) the right*, zur Rechten, the Lat. a dextra, the Hebr. מִן. In making such specifications it is a matter of indifference whether the mind proceeds from the object to be located (towards itself), or from itself towards the object. The former conception the Greeks have adopted (*ἐκ δεξιᾶς*), the latter, the Germans; cf. Goeller, Thuc. 8, 33. For analogous expressions see Thuc. 1. 64; 3, 51, and Her. 3, 101 *οἰκέουσι πρὸς νότου ἀνέμου*. When used of *time*, *ἐκ* denotes the point of departure of a temporal series *since* which something continues to exist, Acts xxiv. 10 *ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν ὄντα σε κριτήν* etc. Jno. vi. 66; ix. 1; Acts ix. 33; Gal. i. 15, *ἐξ ἱκανοῦ* Luke xxiii. 8 (like *ἐκ πολλοῦ*).[1] Here the Greek says *out of*, viewing the time specified, not as we do as a point *from* 385
which something is reckoned, but by a more vivid conception as an 329
expanse *out of* which something extends (as *ἐξ ἡμέρας, ἐξ ἔτους* etc.). 6th ed.

Figuratively, this preposition denotes every *source* and *cause out of* which something issues (hence *ἐκ* and *διά* are related, Franke, Dem. p. 8; Held, Plut. Tim. 331, cf. Fr. Rom. I. 332), and is applied either to things or persons, Acts xix. 25; Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. ii. 2; iii. 5. Under this head the following applications of *ἐκ* deserve attention: Rev. viii. 11 *ἀποθνήσκειν ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων* (ix. 18; Dio C. p. 239, 27, cf. Iliad. 18, 107), Rev. xv. 2 *νικᾶν ἔκ τινος* (victoriam ferre *ex* aliq. Liv. 8, 8 extr.), 1 Cor. ix. 14 345
ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ζῆν (Luke xii. 15 cf. with *ἀπό* Aristot. pol. 3, 3,[2] 7th ed.
ex rapto vivere Ovid. Met. 1, 144), Luke xvi. 9 *ποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας*, Rom. i. 4 *ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν* (source *out of* which convincing evidence flows, cf. Jas. ii. 18). Its use in reference to persons[3] is especially fre-

xxxii. 1), for which in other passages we find *καταβ. ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους*, Matt. viii. 1; Mark ix. 9; Luke ix. 37.

[1] The N. T. passages formerly adduced to show that *ἐκ* means *statim post* do not establish the assertion. Luke xi. 6 signifies come in *from a journey;* xii. 36 return *from the wedding;* Jno. iv. 6 fatigued *from* (by) the journey; 2 Cor. iv. 6 *out of* darkness, light etc. In many of these passages to render *ἐκ immediately after* would be altogether unsuitable; in others it would obtrude a specification of time where the writer thought primarily only of the condition *from, out of* which, etc. Least of all can *ἐκ* be translated *immediately after* in Heb. xi. 35.

[2] *Ζῆν ἐκ τοῦ δικαίου* Demosth. Eubul. 540 b., which *Wahl* quotes in his Clavis, does not come under this head.

[3] This use is very extended, particularly in Herodot., see *Schweighaeus.* Lex. Herod. p. 192. Further, cf. e.g. Diog. L. 1, 54; Philostr. Soph. 2, 12 etc. and *Sturz*, Lexic. Xen. II. 88.

quent and diversified; compare besides, Jno. iii. 25 ἐγένετο ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου (Plato, Theaet. 171 a.), Matt. i. 18 ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου, Jno. vii. 22 οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐστὶν (ἡ περιτομή), Rom. xiii. 3 ἔξεις ἔπαινον ἐξ αὐτῆς (ἐξουσίας), Jno. x. 32 πολλὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα ὑμῖν ἐκ τοῦ πατρός μου, vi. 65 (Her. 8, 114), xviii. 3; 1 Cor. vii. 7; 2 Cor. ii. 2; Rom. v. 16 (Fr. inaccurately translates it by *per*); most of all in reference to sovereigns, rulers, magistrates, Xen. An. 1, 1, 6; Cyr. 8, 6, 9; Her. 1, 69. 121; 2, 151; Polyb. 15, 4, 7. Ἐκ is specially employed to express the *mental state*, the *disposition out of* which something springs, 1 Tim. i. 5 (Rom. vi. 17), Mark xii. 30; Phil. i. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 3 (Plato, Phil. 22 b.; Xen. An. 7, 7, 43 ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς φίλος ἦν, Arrian. Ep. 3, 22, 18; Aristoph. nub. 86); then *the occasion*, Rev. xvi. 21 ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν θεὸν ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς (but not, as Meyer thinks [yet no longer, 4th ed.], in 1 Cor. x. 17) and *the ground* (ratio), Rev. viii. 13 — for each is the source of its consequence (Lucian. asin. 46; Demosth. Con. 727 b.);[1] *the basis*
386 *of a judgment* (from which a judgment is deduced), Matt. xii. (33) 37 see Kypke in loc., Rev. xx. 12; Xen. C. 2, 2, 21 and 3, 6; Aesop. 93, 4 (by a different metaphor we say judge *according to*, *on*, cf. ἐν 1 Jno. iii. 19; v. 2), and consequently the *standard*, 2 Cor. viii. 11. Ἐκ, moreover, sometimes denotes the *price* of a thing, Matt. xxvii. 7 ἠγόρασαν ἐξ αὐτῶν (ἀργυρίων) ἀγρόν (Palaeph. 46, 3), inasmuch as the property is viewed as accruing to us *out of* the money (given for it), cf. Matt. xx. 2 (where the expression is abbreviated). As to ἐξ ἔργων εἶναι and similar phrases in Gal. iii. 10; Rom. iii. 26; iv. 14, 16; Phil. i. 17; Tit. i. 10, see my Comment. on the first passage. In general, the phrase εἶναι ἔκ
330 τινος partakes of all the diversified significations of the preposition,
6th ed. cf. e.g. 1 Cor. xii. 15 ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ χείρ, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ σώματος; by an opposite conception we say belong *to* the body.

That ἐκ never stands for ἐν (as has been assumed even in Greek authors
346 occasionally, see Poppo, Thuc. 2, 7; 8, 62) is beyond question. As to
7th ed. the attraction in Matt. xxiv. 17 αἴρειν τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας see § 66, cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 493.

Ὑπό signifies *from under*, *out from under* (מִתַּחַת) e.g. Hesiod. theog. 669 Ζεὺς . . . ὑπὸ χθονὸς ἦκε etc. Plato, Phaedr. 230 b.

[1] Other passages adduced (e.g. by *Bretschn.*) to prove that ἐκ means *on account of*, are to be excluded. Rom. v. 16 is easily referrible to the idea of source. Acts xxviii. 3 may be rendered, gliding forth *out of* the heat; recent editors, however, read ἀπό.

It commonly accompanies Passive verbs[1] — in order to designate the subject *from* whom the action proceeds, who had the power, therefore, to do or to omit it, — and Neuter verbs also which can be used as Passives; as, 1 Cor. x. 9 ὑπὸ τῶν ὄφεων ἀπώλοντο, Matt. xvii. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Cor. xi. 24; cf. Demosth. Olynth. 3, p. 10 c.; Lucian. Peregr. 19; Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 45; An. 7, 2, 22; Lysias in Theomnest. 4; Pausan. 9, 7, 2; Plat. apol. 17 a. and conv. 222 c.; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 28; Polyaen. 5, 2, 15, and Porson, Eur. Med. p. 97; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 880. In these instances the forces which have produced death, destruction, etc., are regarded as *efficient causes*, killing, destroying, etc.; if, on the contrary, ἀπό had been used (cf. παθεῖν ἀπό Matt. xvi. 21), they would have been 387
designated merely as that from which a result ensued (*occasional causes*). In the former case, the Active construction, *the serpents destroyed*, etc. might have been directly substituted; in the latter, it would be inaccurate. Cf. the difference between βλάπτεσθαι ἀπό τινος and ὑπό τινος in Xen. C. 1, 3, 30; Aeschin. dial. 2, 11. See, in general, Engelhardt, Plat. Apol. p. 174 sq.; Lehmann, Lucian. VIII. 450; II. 23; Schulz vom Abendm. S. 218. Further, ὑπό is applied not merely to persons or animate beings, but also to inanimate agencies, 1 Cor. vi. 12; Col. ii. 18; Jas. i. 14, etc.

The meaning of 2 Pet. i. 17 φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιᾶσδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης is simply: *when such a voice was borne to him by the exalted Majesty.* All other expositions are arbitrary.

Ἀπό means, locally, *from* in the widest sense — whether what has come *from* anything, may have been previously *on*, *with*, *at*, or *beside* (even *in*) the object in question, — principally, therefore, 331
the opposite of ἐπί with the Acc. Diog. L. 1, 24; as, Luke xxiv. 2 6th ed.
εὗρον τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, Matt. xiv. 29 καταβὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου coming down *from* the ship (he was *on* the ship), iii. 16 ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος up *from* the water (not *out of* the water), xv. 27 τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης (they were *on* the table), Acts xxv. 1 ἀνέβη εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπὸ 347
7th ed.

[1] 2 Pet. ii. 7 ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀθέσμων ἀναστροφῆς ἐῤῥύσατο would be an instance of the transition if the words were taken as they stand (*out of* the power of the conduct of the lawless, *under* the influence of which Lot had been left) cf. Iliad. 9, 248 ἐρύεσθαι ὑπὸ Τρώων ὀρυμαγδοῦ, 23, 86. See, in general, *Hm.* Eurip. Hec. p. 11. But the usual mode of connecting ὑπὸ τῆς with καταπονούμενον is to be preferred. Moreover, in Luke viii. 14 also, ὑπό after a Passive is to be recognized (Active Matt. xiii. 22 and Mark iv. 19), where *Bornem.* has proposed another, but not a satisfactory (construction and) exposition, in which, however, *Mey.* concurs.

Καισαρείας from (not *out of*) Caesarea. In its developed application (whether in the realm of matter or of mind) *ἀπό* specially indicates,

a) *Separating, letting go, desisting*, Matt. vii. 23 *ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ*, Luke xxiv. 31 *ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν*, Heb. iv. 4 *κατέπαυσεν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων*, Rev. xviii. 14 (cf. also *ἀποκρύπτειν*, *παρακαλύπτειν ἀπό* Matt. xi. 25; Luke ix. 45, and the pregnant phrases in Col. ii. 20; Rom. ix. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 2; Acts viii. 22; 2 Cor. xi. 3 and the like), and consequently, *remoteness*, Jno. xxi. 8 (Rev. xii. 14; cf. Xen. An. 3, 3, 9; Soph. Oed. Col. 900). Far more frequently,

b) *Proceeding from*, in any respect, — especially temporal origin and commencement *from . . . forward, since* Matt. ix. 22; xxv. 34; 2 Tim. iii. 15; Acts iii. 24, or the *commencement of a series* Matt. ii. 16; Luke xxiv. 27; Jude 14 (*ἀπὸ . . . ἕως* Matt. i. 17; xi. 12; Acts viii. 10, *ἀπὸ . . . εἰς* 2 Cor. iii. 18); hence the *source, material*, or *mass*, from which anything comes, Matt. iii. 4 (Lucian.
388 dial. deor. 7, 4; Her. 7, 65), Acts ii. 17 (Sept.) *ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου*, Luke vi. 13; xv. 16; Jno. xxi. 10; Matt. vii. 16. Further, *ἀπό* expresses *derivation* under manifold aspects Jude 23, *descent* (from a people or country), hence *place of abode, sect* Matt. xxi. 11; xxvii. 57; Jno. xi. 1; xii. 21; Acts ii. 5; xv. 5; Heb. vii. 13 (Polyb. 5, 70, 8; Plut. Brut. c. 2; Her. 8, 114); especially does it indicate, concretely, the *personal* point of departure of an efficiency (viewed merely as such, — not as a conscious and self-moved power, to denote which *παρά* is used with Neuter verbs Schulz, Abdm. S. 215 ff.,[1] and *ὑπό*[2] with Passives, in the N. T. as

[1] After verbs of *receiving, borrowing*, etc. *ἀπό* merely designates simply and in general the *whence:* Matt. xvii. 25 *ἀπὸ τίνων λαμβάνουσι τέλη;* it is *kings* who are the *λαμβάνοντες*; *παρά* would have indicated the *immediate* source, and would have been employed in this passage had the *tax-gatherers* been the *λαμβάνοντες*. In the expression *λαμβάνειν παρά τινος*, the *τις* is always viewed as active (as giving or tendering); in *λαμβάνειν ἀπό τινος*, merely as the proprietor. In 3 Jno. 7 the apostle would have used *παρά* and not *ἀπό* (*τῶν ἐθνῶν*) if the meaning had been that the Gentiles had actually *tendered* a gratuity. In Col. iii. 24 *ἀπὸ κυρίου ἀπολήψεσθε τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν* the reward is indicated as *proceeding from* the Lord; *παρὰ κυρ.*, which Paul might have employed here, would have denoted the Lord's *direct communicating* of the reward. On the other hand, Christ says in Jno. x. 18 with precision, *ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός*. Paul likewise, in 1 Cor. xi. 23, writes *παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* I received from the Lord, not: the Lord himself has (directly, personally, in an *ἀποκάλυψις*) communicated it to me; *παρά*, which some uncial Codd. give, is undoubtedly a correction; see Schulz, as above, 215 ff.; cf. N. theol. Annal. 1818. II. 820 ff.

[2] The Codd. occasionally vary between *ἀπό* and *ὑπό*, as in Mark viii. 31; Rom. xiii. 1, which is frequently the case in those of Greek authors also, *Schaef.* Melet. p. 22, 83 sq.

well as in Greek authors[1]) e.g. Acts xxiii. 21 *τὴν ἀπὸ σοῦ ἐπαγγελίαν* (see above, § 30, 3, note 5), Rom. xiii. 1 *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐξουσία εἰ μὴ ἀπὸ θεοῦ* (immediately followed by *αἱ δὲ οὖσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τεταγμέναι εἰσίν*), Matt. xvi. 21 *παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων* (Lucian. dial. deor. 6, 5; Plat. Phaed. 83 b.), Mark xv. 45 *γνοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ κεντυρίωνος*, Matt. xii. 38 *θέλομεν ἀπὸ σοῦ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν*, Acts ix. 13; Gal. i. 1; 1 Cor. iv. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 13; 1 Jno. ii. 20; iv. 21; Col iii. 24; 2 Thess. i. 9, — and, abstractly, the efficient power itself, and may therefore be rendered *through*, Acts xx. 9 *κατενεχθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕπνου*, Rev. ix. 18. Further, it signifies the *occasion*, Acts xi. 19 (Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 128, 598; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 180), and the *motive*, Matt. xiv. 26 *ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν for fear*, xiii. 44; Luke xxi. 26; xxii. 45; xxiv. 41; Acts xii. 14; Plutarch. Lysand. 23; Vig. p. 581, — the (objective) cause, *propter*, Matt. xviii. 7 (according to some Heb. v. 7 also; see Bleek), or *prae* (in negative expressions), Acts xxii. 11 *οὐκ ἐνέβλεπον ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ φωτός on account of* (for) *the splendor* (his not seeing arose *from* the splendor), Luke xix. 3; Jno. xxi. 6, see Kypke in loc. (Acts xxviii. 3 var.), cf. Held, Plut. Tim. 314 (Judith 348 7th ed. 332 6th ed. 389

Schweighaeuser, Lexic. Polyb. p. 69, and others. Further, we find *ἀπό* for *ὑπό* after Passives in later writers more and more frequently (especially in the Byzantines; see e.g. Index to Malalas in the Bonn edit.); in earlier authors this interchange is on the whole rare, yet see *Poppo* ad Thuc. III. I. 158; *Bhdy* 224.

[1] In Jas. i. 13 *ἀπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι* means simply, *I am tempted* (through influences proceeding) *from God*, and is a more vague expression than *ὑπὸ θεοῦ πειράζομαι* which would be identical with *θεὸς πειράζει με*. The words that follow, *πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα*, merely show that the apostle has *also* in mind a direct temptation by God (cf. *Hm.* Soph. Oed. Col. 1531; *Schoemann*, Plutarch. Cleom. p. 237); the phrase *ἀπὸ θεοῦ* is very frequently a sort of Adverb, *divinitus*. In Luke vi. 18 the words *πνευμ. ἀκαθ.* signify the malady itself; had the expression been e.g. *ὀχλούμενοι ἀπὸ νόσων*, it would have presented no difficulty. In Luke ix. 22; xvii. 25, *ἀποδοκιμάζεσθαι ἀπό* is simply: to be rejected *on the part of* the elders. That in Acts xii. 20 *διὰ τὸ τρέφεσθαι αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν ἀπὸ τῆς βασιλικῆς* (Arist. pol. 4, 6) *ἀπό* is not used instead of *ὑπό*, is quite obvious. *Schneckenburger*, ad Jac. i. 13, who asserts that it is, has in general not discriminated with sufficient care. As to Matt. xi. 19 see *Fr.* in loc. and *Lehmann*, Lucian. VI. 544; 2 Cor. vii. 13 does not at all come under this head; *ἀπό* there means *from* (through influence proceeding *from*). In Acts x. 17 (text. rec.) *οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορνηλίου* (Arrian Epict. 3, 22. 23) is simply: those sent *from* C., the deputation *from* C.; whereas *ἀπεστ. ὑπό* (which some Codd. [Sin. also] give as a correction) would be more definite: those whom he (in person) had sent; cf. 1 Thess. iii. 6 *ἐλθόντος Τιμοθέου πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀφ' ὑμῶν* (they had not *sent* him). In 1 Cor. i. 30 *ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν ἀπὸ θεοῦ who became to us wisdom from God*, *ὑπό* is not necessary, cf. Her. 5, 125 (see also *Stallb.* Plat. rep. 103). Finally, in Jas. v. 4 *ὁ μισθὸς ὁ ἀπεστερημένος ἀφ' ὑμῶν*, probably *ἀπό* was used designedly: *on your part, by you* (though not solely or directly). (Both prepositions occur together in significations obviously different in Luke v. 15 according to some Codd. and in Rom. xiii. 1, cf. Euseb. H. E. 2, 6, p. 115, *Heinichen.*)

ii. 20, Gen. xxxvi. 7 etc.; Her. 2, 64). Acts xvi. 33 is a pregnant construction: ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν he *washed* and cleansed them *from their stripes*, i.c. from the blood with which they were covered in consequence of the blows. Matt. vii. 16 is evidently, *from their fruits* (objectively) will the knowledge be *derived* (Arrian. Epict. 4, 8, 10), — (the case is different in Luke xxi. 30 ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν γινώσκετε, 2 Cor. x. 7, where the *subjective* power whence the knowledge comes is indicated; ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, indeed, often signifying *sponte*).

Schleusner and Kühnöl maintain that ἀπό denotes also 1) *in*, Acts
333 xv. 38 τὸν ἀποστάντα ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀπὸ Παμφυλίας who had left them *in*
6th ed. Pamphylia. But the obvious meaning is: *who had left them* (as they
390 were proceeding) *out of Pamphylia*. This is quite different from ἐν Π.,
349 which might have implied that Marcus remained *in* P. but separated from
7th ed. Paul, cf. xiii. 13. 2) *de*, Acts xvii. 2 διελέγετο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν; but this means: starting (in his discourses) *from* the Scriptures, or drawing his arguments *from* the Scriptures (cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 340 d.); cf. Acts xxviii. 23. Nor is the signification *de* supported by Her. 4, 53. 195 (Schweighaeuser, Lexic. Herod. I. 77). 3) *per*, Acts xi. 19 διασπαρέντες ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως, which however means *owing to the persecution*, the persecution being the occasion or incidental cause. 4) *modo*, *instar*, 2 Tim. i. 3 ἀπὸ προγόνων, see also Flatt in loc. The phrase signifies, *from my forefathers* (Polyb. 5, 55, 9), with the sentiments inherited from them. On such passages as Jno. xi. 18; Rev. xiv. 20 see § 61, 5 remark p. 557.

c. Ἀμφί does not occur in the N. T.

d. Πρό *before* (in a wider sense than ἀντί), *locally* in Acts v. 23; Jas. v. 9, also Acts xiv. 13, cf. Heliod. 1, 11, 30; Boeckh, Corp. inscript. II. 605. It is more frequently used *temporally*, either with nouns of time, 2 Tim. iv. 21 πρὸ χειμῶνος, Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 2; Matt. viii. 29, and the Inf. of verbs, Matt. vi. 8; Jno. i. 49, or with personal pronouns and names of persons, Jno. v. 7 πρὸ ἐμοῦ, x. 8; Rom. xvi. 7. It is used *figuratively* in Jas. v. 12 πρὸ πάντων *ante omnia*, 1 Pet. iv. 8 (Xen. M. 2, 5, 3; Herod. 5, 4, 2). As to the original use of this preposition, explaining its construction with the Gen., see Bhdy. p. 231.

e. Περί. The fundamental meaning of this preposition may be discerned in its construction with the Dative. With that case it denotes *encircling*, *shutting in*, on several or on all sides (closely related to ἀμφί, which signifies shutting in on both sides). Hence it is different from παρά, which merely indicates that one object is *near to*, *beside* another. Περί with the Gen. is used in prose

almost exclusively in a figurative sense (yet cf. Odyss. 5, 68),[1] to designate an object as the *centre* of activity, around which the activity is conceived as moving, — e.g. *contending*, *drawing lots*, *caring*, *about* anything, Matt. vi. 28; Mark xiii. 32; Jno. x. 13; xix. 24;[2] and then quite usually *deciding*, *knowing*, *hearing*, 391
speaking, *about*, *concerning* (de, super), see above, p. 361. At other times it is to be rendered by *for* (as pray *for* one), Jno. 384
xvi. 26; Acts viii. 15; Heb. xiii. 18; Luke xix. 37; 1 Thess. i. 2; 6th ed.
or *on account of*, Jno. xv. 22; Acts xv. 2; xxv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18 (although many traces of *about* are to be discerned in these cases), 350
or *in reference to*, Matt. iv. 6; Rom. xv. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 1; Jno. 7th ed.
vii. 17; Demosth. Ol. 1, § 11. In the last sense περί with its substantive is put at the beginning of a sentence in appearance absolutely, as an exponendum (Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 157 and Tim. p. 97), 1 Cor. xvi. 1 περὶ τῆς λογίας etc. *quod ad pecunias attinet*, although these words are grammatically connected with ὥσπερ διέταξα; and still more perceptibly in 1 Cor. xvi. 12 περὶ Ἀπολλώ, πολλὰ παρεκάλεσα αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς etc. (cf. Papyri Taur. 1, 6, 31; *de* is similarly used e.g. in Cic. fam. 3, 12). Sometimes περί appears to signify superiority, *over and above*, *prae*, as in the Homeric περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων (Bhdy. 260).[3] Some (Beza) have taken it in this sense in 3 Jno. 2 περὶ πάντων εὔχομαί σε etc. *above all* (Schott); Lücke, in support of this explanation, quotes a passage from Dion. H. II. 1412 (where, however, περὶ ἁπάντων means *in reference to* etc.). Still, it seems to me that the impossibility of connecting περὶ πάντ. with the Infinitives which follow (Bengel and BCrus. in loc.) has not yet been shown.

f. Πρός. The meaning *from* (something) *hitherwards*, which accords with the primary force of the Genitive, flows from its *local*

[1] That the *local* sense *around* is not without example in (later) prose writers, has been shown by *Locella*, Xen. Ephes. p. 269; cf. *Schaef.* Dion. comp. 351. Accordingly, in Acts xxv. 18 περὶ οὗ might be joined with σταθέντες (as is done by *Mey.*), cf. vs. 7 περιέστησαν οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καταβεβηκότες Ἰουδαῖοι.

[2] Verbs of *caring for*, etc. are construed also with ὑπέρ, see ὑπέρ, below. As to the distinction between the two constructions, *Weber*, Demosth. p. 130 says: περί solam mentis circumspectionem vel respectum rei, ὑπέρ simul animi propensionem etc. significat. Verbs of *contending* (*about* or *for* anything) have the same double construction. Hence in one and the same passage περί and ὑπέρ are sometimes contrasted, *Franke*, Demosth. p. 6 sq.

[3] Even here, however, as the construction was originally viewed the preposition undoubtedly bears the signification *around*. *Surpassing around* all is he who by his superiority so encircles, as it were, all, that no one can emerge from the mass. *Before* all marks the relation only on *one* side; περί, on all sides.

use, Hm. Vig. p. 863, and is evident also from examples like τὸ ποιεύμενον πρὸς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων Her. 7, 209, πάσχομεν πρὸς αὐτῆς Alciphr. 1, 20 (Bhdy. 264) and εἶναι πρός τινος *to be on one's side*, cf. ad Herenn. 2, 27 *ab* reo facere. Hence πρὸς ἐμοῦ, like e re nostra, to my advantage, according to my interest, Lob. Phryn. 20; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 265. Πρός in this sense gives way in the N. T. to ἀπό and ἐκ; it is used only once, Acts xxvii. 34 τοῦτο (taking nourishment) πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας ὑπάρχει *is for* (conducive to) *your deliverance*, strictly, is on the side, as it were, of your deliverance. A similar expression occurs in Thuc. 3, 59 οὐ πρὸς τῆς ὑμετέρας δόξης non cedet vobis in gloriam.

392 g. Ἐπί. The primary import of ἐπί, which might justify its being used with the Gen., has almost disappeared, unless we choose to translate e.g. Luke iv. 29 ὄρους, ἐφ' οὗ ἡ πόλις αὐτῶν ᾠκοδόμητο *up from which* (on which upwards) was built (D. Sic. 3, 47; Polyb. 10, 10, 5). Usually ἐπί indicates the being *upon*, *above*, a place (point or level), whether the object is regarded as at rest or in motion,[1] Matt. x. 27 κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων, xxiv. 30 ἐρχόμενον
335 ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν, ix. 2, 6; Acts v. 15; viii. 28; Rev. xiii. 1; 1 Cor.
6th ed. xi. 10; Luke xxii. 21, especially ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (opposed to ἐν τῷ
351 οὐρανῷ) cf. Xen. An. 3, 2, 19; Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 15. Applied to
7th ed. waters, it may refer not merely to their surface, Rev. v. 13 ἐπὶ τ. θαλάσσης,[2] but also to their coasts or banks (cf. Arrian. Al. 1, 18, 10) Jno. xxi. 1 ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης *by the sea, on the sea-shore* (Polyb. 1, 44, 4; Xen. An. 4, 3, 28; 2 Kings ii. 7, cf. the Hebrew עַל). It is further applied to elevated objects (up) *on* which something is placed e.g. *on the cross* Acts v. 30; Jno. xix. 19. On the other hand, the local sense of *beside*, *near*,[3] alleged in N. T. Lexicons,

[1] *Wittmann*, de natura et potest. praep. ἐπί. Schweinf. 1846. 4to. In most cases the Latin language employs *in* for it. The German *auf*, which is applied both to heights and to plains, corresponds to the Greek word in many respects. Mark viii. 4 ἐπ' ἐρημίας entirely resembles the German *auf* dem Felde, though we do not employ *auf* in that particular phrase. Cf. Matt. iv. 1 ἀνήχθη εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.

[2] Here belongs also Jno. vi. 19 (it seems that in Matt. xiv. 25 ἐπὶ τὴν θάλ. must be read) περιπατεῖν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλ. *to walk on the sea*, cf. Lucian. philops. 13 βαδίζειν ἐφ' ὕδατος, vera hist. 2, 4 ἐπὶ τοῦ πελάγους διαθέοντες (Job ix. 8). *By itself* ἐπὶ τ. θαλ. might indeed also be translated *on the edge of* the sea. This assuredly *Fr.* Mt. p. 502 did not mean to deny.

[3] Even in the case of things on the same *level*, the Greek, by a conventional or ethical conception which we not seldom share, speaks of an *above*. *Above the door* (Her. 5, 92) might, for instance, be applied to a person who stands near the door *inside the room;* on the other hand, *under the door* to one *outside*, at the door. Cf. as to the kindred ὑπέρ *Bhdy.* S. 243. The relation is conceived very differently in different languages.

cannot be certainly established. In Luke xxii. 40 τόπος refers to a hill (though we also say *on* the spot); in Matt. xxi. 19 ἐπὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ means *on* the way; in Acts xx. 9 ἐπὶ τῆς θυρίδος is *upon* the window; in Jno. vi. 21 τὸ πλοῖον ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is used of the landing of a vessel, and ἐπί refers to the rising shore; yet see what has been said before.

The figurative meanings of ἐπί are quite plain. It is used,

a) Of authority and superintendence *over* etc.; as, Matt. ii. 22 βασιλεύειν ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας, Rev. xi. 6; Acts viij. 27 εἶναι ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γάζης, vi. 3; xii. 20; Rom. ix. 5 εἶναι ἐπὶ πάντων, Eph. iv. 6; 393
cf. Polyb. 1, 34, 1; 2, 65, 9; Arrian. Al. 3, 5, 4; Reitz, Lucian. VI. 448 Bip.; Schaef. Demosth. II. 172; Held, Plutarch. Timol. 388.

b) Of the subject, the ground-work as it were, of an action; as, Jno. vi. 2 σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων which he wrought *on* the sick (cf. Mtth. 1368); particularly of speaking, Gal. iii. 16 οὐ λέγει ... ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν as *of* (upon) many (speaking of many), cf. scribere, disserere *super* re, and Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 2, 24; 6, 25; Epict. ench. 3; Heind. Plat. Charm. 62; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 114; Schoem. Plutarch. Agid. p. 76; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 436.

c) Of presence, *before* (coram), particularly before judges, magistrates, etc. (in the phrase bring *up before*), Matt. xxviii. 14; [Mark xiii. 9]; Acts xxiii. 30; xxiv. 20; xxv. 9; 1 Cor. vi. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 13 (cf. Ael. 8, 2; Lucian. catapl. 16; Dio. C. p. 825; Schoem. Isae. 293); and then in general, 1 Tim. v. 19 ἐπὶ μαρτύρων *before* (with) witnesses (Xen. Hell. 6, 5, 38; vectig. 3, 14; Lucian. philops. 22; Mätzner, Antiph. p. 165);[1] also 2 Cor. vii. 14 (before, i.e. in presence of, Titus), see Wetst. I. 443, 562; Schaef. Melet. p. 105. 336

d) In a related sense, with names of persons, of *the reign*, Acts 6th ed.
xi. 28 ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου *under* Claudius, Mark ii. 26 (Raphel. and 352
Fr. in loc.), Luke iii. 2 (Her. 1, 15; Aeschin. dial. 3, 4; Xen. C. 8, 4, 5, etc.; Bremi, Demosth. p. 165; Schweigh. Lexic. Herod. I. 243; Sturz, Lexic. Dion. Cass. p. 148); likewise simply of the lifetime (ἐπ' ἐμοῦ in my time), especially of prominent characters, Luke iv. 27 ἐπὶ Ἐλισσαίου (Xen. C. 1, 6, 31; Plat. rep. 10, 599 e.; Crit. 112 a.; Alciphr. 1, 5 ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων, Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 27); also with words denoting conditions and events (Xen. C. 8, 7, 1; Herod. 2, 9, 7) Matt. i. 11 ἐπὶ τῆς μετοικεσίας Βαβ. *at the time of the exile;* lastly, directly of time, Heb. i. 1 ἐπ' ἐσχάτου

[1] The phrase in full would be, ἐπὶ στόματος δύο μαρτύρων etc. Matt. xviii. 16; 2 Cor. xiii. 1 (after the Hebrew עַל־פִּי). Even here, strictly, ἐπί means simply *with: with* (*on*) *the testimony of ... witnesses.*

τῶι ἡμερῶν τούτων *in* the last of these days, 1 Pet. i. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 3, cf. Num. xxiv. 14; Gen. xlix. 1 (ἐπί τῶν ἀρχαίων χρόνων Aristot. polit. 3, 10; Polyb. 1, 15, 12; Isocr. paneg. c. 44); and in general, of that with which something else is connected, Rom. i. 10 ἐπὶ τῶν προσευχῶν μου *at* (in) my prayers, 1 Thess. i. 2; Eph. i. 16. The import of ἐπί is not quite the same in Mark xii. 26 ἐπὶ τοῦ βάτου *at* the bush, i.e. concisely, at the passage relating to the bush.

394 Sometimes ἐπί in a local sense is also used with verbs of direction, and even with verbs of motion (Bhdy. 246) *to, towards, forth upon;* as, Matt. xxvi. 12 βαλοῦσα τὸ μύρον ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος *on* (over) *my body*, Acts x. 11 σκεῦός τι ... καθιέμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς *let down on* (to) *the earth*, Mark xiv. 35 ἔπιπτεν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς *upon the earth*, Heb. vi. 7. So very frequently in Greek authors, Her. 1, 164; 2, 73. 75. 119; 4, 14; 5, 33; Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 1, and Hellen. 1, 6, 20; 3, 4, 12; 5, 3, 6; 7, 1, 28 etc.; Sturz, Lexic. Xen. II. 258; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 339; Wittmann, de natura et potestate praepositionis ἐπί. Schweinfurt, 1846. 4to. In this application ἐπί originally includes the notion of remaining *on, upon*, see Rost 553 (somewhat differently explained in Krü. 302).[1] Such passages as Rev. x. 2; Luke viii. 16; Jno. xix. 19; Acts v. 15 (τιθέναι ἐπὶ τοῦ etc.) are traceable, like ponere *in loco*, to a different view of the action.

h. Μετά properly signifies *among, amidst* (μέσος), Luke xxiv. 5 τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν; Mark i. 13. Hence it denotes *with* (together with), Luke v. 30 μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν ἐσθίετε, Jno. xx. 7; and that in reference to personal association, Jno. iii. 22; xviii. 2; Acts ix. 39; Matt. xii. 42; Heb. xi. 9,[2] and alternate action, Jno. iv. 27 λαλεῖν μετά τινος, vi. 43 γογγύζειν μετ' ἀλλήλων, Matt. xviii. 23 συναίρειν λόγον μετά τινος, cf. Rev. ii. 16, 22; Luke
353 xii. 13; especially if intellectual or moral, Matt. xx. 2 συμφωνεῖν
7th ed. μετά τινος, ii. 3; Luke xxiii. 12; Acts vii. 9; Rom. xii. 15; 1 Jno. i. 6 (εἶναι μετά τινος Matt. xii. 30, cf. Xen. C. 2, 4, 7); sometimes
337 where we should employ *on* or *towards*, erga, as Luke x. 37 ὁ ποιήσας
6th ed. τὸ ἔλεος μετ' ἐμοῦ, i. 72 (עִם; probably not Acts xiv. 27), for we regard the individual towards whom kindness is shown as the object, not as the partner, of the act. But μετά is applied also to things, Luke xiii. 1 ὧν τὸ αἷμα ἔμιξεν μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν, Matt.

[1] This distinction was perceived by so early a writer as *Bengel* (on Heb. vi. 7).

[2] Under this head comes also the Hebraistic πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου Acts ii. 28 Sept. (אֶת־פָּנֶיךָ), which must not be taken in a merely local signification.

xxvii. 34, especially to express equipment, accompaniment, environment, Luke xxii. 52 ἐξεληλύθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν, Jno. xviii. 3; Matt. xxiv. 31 (Dem. Pantaen. p. 628 c.; Herod. 5, 6, 19); then of accompanying actions and circumstances, particularly states of mind (Bhdy. 255), Heb. xii. 17 μετὰ δακρύων ἐκζητήσας (Herod. 1, 16, 10), 1 Tim. iv. 14; Matt. xiv. 7; Mark x. 30; Acts v. 26; xvii. 11 ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας, Matt. xiii. 20; xxviii. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 15 (Eurip. Hippol. 205; Soph. Oed. C. 1636; Alciphr. 3, 38; Arist. magn. Mor. 2, 6; Herod. 1, 5, 19); lastly, 395
of the inward connection of spiritual objects, Eph. vi. 23 ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως. In good prose μετά never designates the *instrument* as such (Kypke I. 143),[1] — in 1 Tim. iv. 14 μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν is *with*, *amid*, the laying on of hands (simultaneously with the act of imposition), Matt. xiv. 7 μεθ' ὅρκου interposito jurejurando (Heb. vii. 21) — yet it borders on this signification in Luke xvii. 15 μετὰ φωνῆς μεγάλης δοξάζων (essentially equivalent to φωνῇ μεγάλῃ or ἐν φωνῇ μ.), and perhaps in Acts xiii. 17;[2] (cf. Polyb. 1, 49, 9 ἤθροιζε μετὰ κηρύγματος, Lucian. philops. 8 βοηθεῖν τινι μετὰ τῆς τέχνης, as σύν is used in other writers, at least in poets, Bhdy. S. 214). As to Matt. xxvii. 66, however, see Fr. It never signifies *after*;[3] in Mark x. 30 μετὰ διωγμῶν is, *amid* persecutions, as μετὰ κινδύνων is *amid* dangers, Thuc. 1, 18 a. Kühnöl and BCrus. erroneously render μετά with the Gen. in Matt. xii. 41 by *contra*; the meaning is: the men of Nineveh will appear at the judgment *with* this generation, i.e. when this generation appears before the judgment-seat, the Ninevites will appear also; for what purpose (*against*) we are first told by the words that follow. (The use of the Gen. with μετά is accounted for by the fact that whatever attends or surrounds any one bears to him a certain relation of dependence.)

i. Διά. Its primary meaning is *through*, 1 Cor. xiii. 12 (Plat. Phaed. 109 c.); but with the idea of *going through* is connected always, in the local sense, that of *going forth* or *out from* (thus in 354
Hebrew and Arabic בְּ is the only preposition for the local *through*; 7th ed.
cf. also Fabric. Pseudepigr. I. 191 ἐκφεύγειν δι' αἰῶνος, Matt iv. 4

[1] The meaning of μετὰ λύχνου *Fabric.* Pseudepigr. II. 143 is: *with a light*, i.e. furnished with a light, carrying it with him, *cum lumine*, not *lumine*. On the other hand, cf. Leo Gramm. p. 260 μαχαίριον ἐπιφέρεται βουλόμενος ἀνελεῖν σε μετ' αὐτοῦ, p. 275 etc.

[2] Yet μετά here is probably to be understood of the accompaniment: *with upraised arm*, as he held up his arm over them (to protect them).

[3] *Fabric.* Pseudepigr. II. 593 μετὰ τοῦ ἐλθεῖν is undoubtedly an error in transcribing, for τὸ ἐλθεῖν. Further, the passages collected by *Raphel.* Mr. l.c. prove nothing.

ἐκπορεύεσθαι διά from Deut. viii. 3, and διεξέρχεσθαι Plat. rep.
338 10, 621 a.);[1] hence διά governs the Genitive. It is applied to space
6th ed. in simple expressions, Luke iv. 30 αὐτὸς διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο (Herod. 2, 1, 3), 1 Cor. iii. 15 σωθήσεται ... ὡς διὰ πυρός, Rom. xv. 28 ἀπελεύσομαι δι' ὑμῶν εἰς Σπανίαν i.e. *through* your city (Thuc. 5, 4; Plut. virt. mul. p. 192 Lips.), Acts xiii. 49 διεφέρετο ὁ λόγος δι' ὅλης τῆς χώρας *from one extremity to the other*;
396 (*throughout*, Odyss. 12, 335; Plat. symp. p. 220 b.), 2 Cor. viii. 18 οὗ ὁ ἔπαινος ... διὰ πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

From this local *through*, in Greek as in all languages, the transition is easy to the instrument (whether animate or inanimate), as that *through* which the effect as it were passes (cf. in particular 1 Pet. i. 7), that which intervenes between the volition and the deed, e.g. 3 Jno. 13 οὐ θέλω διὰ μέλανος καὶ καλάμου γράφειν, 2 Jno. 12 (Plut. vit. Solon. p. 87 e.), 2 Cor. vi. 7; 1 Cor. xiv. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 2 διὰ λόγου, δι' ἐπιστολῆς, by word of mouth, by letter, Heb. xiii. 22 διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν *paucis* scripsi vobis, see § 64; thence it is applied to immaterial objects, as in 1 Cor. vi. 14 ἡμᾶς ἐξεγερεῖ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, Rom. iii. 25 ὃν προέθετο ἱλαστήριον διὰ τῆς πίστεως, Rom. ii. 12; Jas. ii. 12 κρίνεσθαι διὰ νόμου; to persons, as in Acts iii. 16 ἡ πίστις ἡ δι' αὐτοῦ, 1 Cor. iii. 5 διάκονοι, δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε, Heb. iii. 16 οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωϋσέως. Thus in particular in the expression διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ of the (mediatorial) agency of Christ in all its manifestations, Rom. ii. 16; v. 1; 2 Cor. i. 5; Gal. i. 1; Eph. i. 5; Phil. i. 11; Tit. iii. 6 etc.,[2] as also in διὰ πνεύματος (ἁγίου) Rom. v. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 8; Eph. iii. 16. To this (instrumental) use may be referred likewise 2 Tim. ii. 2 διὰ πολλῶν μαρτύρων *intervenientibus multis testibus*, *through the interposition* i.e. here in the presence of many witnesses, Heb. vii. 9 διὰ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Λευὶ δεδεκάτωται *through* Abraham (that is, in the person of Abraham as representative of the whole Israelitish people, when Abraham was tithed Levi also was tithed). Διά but rarely indicates the *causa principalis*,[3] 1 Cor.

[1] Cf. *Kühner* II. 281 and my 5th Progr. de verbis composit. p. 3.

[2] This expression comes essentially under the same head when it is joined to *praising, thanking*, etc. Rom. i. 8; vii. 25; xvi. 27; Col. iii. 17. Not merely the benefits for which thanks are offered are procured through Christ, but even the thanksgiving itself is offered (if so as to be acceptable to God) through Christ who lives with God and continues the work of mediation for his people. The Christian does not give thanks in his proper person, but through Christ, whom he regards as the mediator of his prayer as well as of salvation. *Philippi* on Rom. i. 8 is unsatisfactory; *Bengel* on the same passage is better.

[3] As to the Latin *per* for *a*, see *Hand*, Tursell. IV. 436 sq. *The wrong done through*

i. 9 (Gal. iv. 7 var.), in other words but rarely seems to be equivalent to *ὑπό* or *παρά*; but even in such cases it does not designate the author as such, i.e. as the one *from* whom something proceeds, but rather as the person *through* whose effort, or kindness etc. something accrues to one cf. Gal. i. 1 (without specifying whether it flows *from* him directly or indirectly).[1] We may add with Fr. (Rom. I. 15): *est autem hic usus ibi tantum admissus, ubi nullam sententiae ambiguitatem crearet;* thus in Gal. i. 1, after the discriminating use of *ἀπό* and *διά*, *διά* alone is employed in summing up, and employed too of God. Many passages, however, have been erroneously referred to this class: in Jno. i. 3, 17 the doctrine of the Logos justifies the *per* of mediate agency, cf. Origen in loc. (Tom. I. 108 Lommatzsch); in Rom. i. 5 *δι' οὗ* is explained from xv. 15; Rom. xi. 36, owing to the prepositions *ἐκ* and *εἰς*, admits no other interpretation; on Gal. iii. 19 see my Comment.; in Rom. v. 2 nobody will be misled by Fr's. remarks; in Heb. ii. 3 Christ is viewed as commissioned by God to proclaim salvation; as to 1 Pet. ii. 14 see Steiger in loc.[2] 355 7th ed. 339 6th ed. 297

To the idea of instrumentality *διά* can also be referred when used of the state of mind in which one does something, e.g. *δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδέχεσθαι*, *τρέχειν* Rom. viii. 25; Heb. xii. 1; Plut. educ. 5, 3;[3] probably also 2 Cor. v. 7 *διὰ πίστεως περιπατοῦμεν*. Hence *διά* serves as a circumlocution for an adjective, 2 Cor. iii. 11 *εἰ τὸ καταργούμενον* (*ἐστὶ*) *διὰ δόξης* (i.e. *ἔνδοξον*) Mtth. II. 1353. *Διά* is more loosely used of one's equipment, and of the circumstances

me, and *the wrong done by me,* may on the whole express quite the same thing; yet the wrong-doer is viewed in these expressions under two different aspects. Probably *διά* is employed purposely in Matt. xxvi. 24 *τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται* (the betrayer was merely an instrument, cf. Rom. viii. 32) and in Acts ii. 43 *πολλά τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγίνετο*, as the efficient cause was God himself (Acts ii. 22; xv. 12), cf. *διὰ χειρῶν* v. 12; xiv. 3. That this more precise mode of expression is not observed everywhere and by all writers does not invalidate this exposition.

[1] Nearly to the same effect is the remark of *Bremi* on Corn. Nep. 10, 1, 4. Even conceded that *διά* and *ὑπό* are wholly identical, it would not follow that Gal. iii. 19 (*νόμος*) *διαταγεὶς δι' ἀγγέλων* represents the angels as *authors* of the Mosaic Law (as *Schulthess* persisted in asserting). To justify any departure from the plain meaning — *ordained through angels* — far other and more solid reasons must be assigned than those urged by Schulthess.

[2] At first sight *τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* 1 Thess. iv. 2 appears strange. But as the Apostle was not acting in his private capacity, but as moved by Christ, the charges he issued were properly charges given through Christ.

[3] Xen. C. 4, 6, 6 is of a different sort. Also in 2 Cor. ii. 4 *ἔγραψα ὑμῖν διὰ πολλῶν δακρύων* is, properly, *through many tears.* *Amid* many tears is an expression somewhat similar; see above, *μετά* p. 376 sq.

and relations under which he does something, e.g. 1 Jno. v. 6 ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος *came by means of water and blood*, Heb. ix. 12 (yet see Bleek in loc.), Rom. ii. 27 σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην ὄντα *with letter and circumcision*, i.e. notwithstanding that thou wast in possession of a written law etc., iv. 11; xiv. 20 ὁ διὰ προσκόμματος ἐσθίων *he who eateth with offence* (giving offence), (Markland, Lys. V. 329 Reisk.).

356 7th ed. 398

Applied to *time*, διὰ denotes, a) *During* (i.e. within a space of time), Heb. ii. 15 διὰ παντὸς τοῦ ζῆν (Xen. Cyr. 2, 1, 19; Mem. 1, 2, 61; Plat. conv. 203 d.); even though the action takes place but once or occasionally within the period mentioned, as in Acts v. 19; xvi. 9 etc. (of which laxer use no instances are to be found in literary Greek, Fr. in Fritzschior. Opusc. p. 164 sq.).

340 6th ed.

b) *After*,[1] as δι' ἐτῶν πλειόνων Acts xxiv. 17, properly *interjectis* pluribus annis, *many years intervening*,[2] i.e. after the lapse of many years (see Perizon. Aelian. p. 921 ed. Gronov.; Blomfield, Aesch. Pers. 1006; Wetst. I. 525, 558), and Gal. ii. 1, cf. Her. 6, 118; Plat. legg. 8, 834 e.; Arist. anim. 8, 15; Polyb. 22, 26, 22; Geopon. 14, 26, 2; Plutarch. Agis 10; Lucian. Icar. 24, also Sept. Deut. ix. 11. Lastly, Mark ii. 1 δι' ἡμερῶν *after* (some) *days* (Theophr. plant. 4, 4 δι' ἡμερῶν τινων), cf. διὰ χρόνου Plat. Euthyd. 273 b.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 28 (Raphel, Kypke, and Fr. in loc.).

The following significations have been erroneously attributed to διά:

a. *Into* (in with the Acc.): 1 Cor. xiii. 12 βλέπομεν δι' ἐσόπτρου is said agreeably to a popular notion; the look passes *through* the mirror, inasmuch as the form appears to be standing behind the mirror.

b. *Cum:* 1 Cor. xvi. 3 δι' ἐπιστολῶν τούτους πέμψω ἀπενεγκεῖν etc. is to be rendered, *by means of* letters, so as to recommend them by letters (Syriac ܒܐܓܪ̈ܐ). To be sure, the Apostle means at the same time

[1] No one will deny this signification who is not trying to find in the above passage of Gal. confirmation of his own previous decision respecting the chronology of Paul's travels. That the preposition *can* have this meaning becomes plain, whether, with *Mtth.* 1352, we derive it from the notion of distance which διά in a local sense denotes, or from the notion of passing through a succession of points of time (which are thereby indicated as travelled through, gone over), *Hm.* Vig. 856. The assertion that διά is thus applied only to a period of time after which something occurs as its *result*, is a subtilty which has no foundation in usage, and a misapplication of the notion of *means* (itself figurative) to explain a temporal use of the preposition, — a use always most closely connected with its local and primary import. Even, however, were the alleged restriction to be admitted, it would not be impossible to apply the expression διὰ δεκατ. ἐτῶν in Gal. ii. 1 to a journey the necessity of which Paul felt *in consequence* of an active ministry of fourteen years. At least, κατὰ ἀποκάλ. in vs. 2 could not be urged as a decisive argument on the other side.

[2] Her. 3, 157 διαλιπὼν ἡμέρας δέκα, Isocr. perm. p. 746.

that they themselves should take the letters *with* them; but still the import of the Preposition is strictly preserved.

c. *Ad:* 2 Pet. i. 3 καλέσαντος ἡμᾶς διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς is not *ad relig. Christ. adduxit eo consilio, ut consequeremini felicitatem* etc., but *called us by* (*means of*) *glory and might*, so that in this call God's power and 399
majesty were exhibited (vs. 4, cf. 1 Pet. ii. 9). Some Codd. [Sin. also] give δόξῃ καὶ ἀρετῇ.

d. *On account of*, for διά with the Acc. (only thus in very late writers, e.g. Acta apocr. p. 252): In 2 Cor. ix. 13 διά denotes rather the occasion 357
which gives rise to the δοξάζειν; whereas what follows, ἐπὶ τῇ ὑποταγῇ, 7th ed.
means, *for* i.e. *on account of* the obedience. In 1 Cor. i. 21 οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν may very well be rendered: *by means of their* (boasted vs. 20) *wisdom* (it did not conduct them to this result); though the interpretation of others, *in consequence of* (sheer) *wisdom*, if taken thus: by the possession of wisdom (see above), is grammatically 341
admissible. But διὰ τῆς μωρίας which immediately follows is decisive in 6th ed.
favor of the former explanation. Rom. vii. 4 ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος Χριστοῦ is elucidated by verses 1–3: Ye were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; with the death of the body of Christ (which had reference to the law) ye are made dead (slain) to the law. That in 1 Cor. xi. 12 διὰ τῆς γυναικός is not used for διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα (which would introduce here an extraneous thought) is the more clear from the circumstance that it is manifestly to be taken as corresponding to ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρός; the distinction between ἐκ and διά is obvious. In 2 Cor. viii. 8 (Schott) διὰ τῆς ἑτέρ. σπουδῆς is to be joined to δοκιμάζων, see Bengel. Heb. xi. 39 (Schott) πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως is, *who through their faith have obtained a good report.* Likewise the rendering *per* (Schott) in exhortations and adjurations (*by*), Rom. xii. 1; xv. 30; 1 Cor. i. 10; 2 Cor. x. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 12, is entirely unfounded. To *exhort* or *adjure* one *through* the mercies of God, *through* the name of Christ, means: referring to, reminding of etc.; διά indicates the consideration held out to strengthen the exhortation.

k. *Κατά.* Its primary import is *down*, *de* (down upon, down from), cf. κάτω (Xen. A. 4, 2, 17 ἀλλόμενοι κατὰ τῆς πέτρας, 1, 5, 8 τρέχειν κατὰ πρανοῦς γηλόφου, Her. 8, 53): Matt. viii. 32 ὥρμησε πᾶσα ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ (Galen. protrept. 2 κατὰ κρημνῶν, Dio Chr. 7, 99; Porphyr. abstin. 4, 15; Aelian. 7, 14; Pausan. 10, 2, 2), 1 Cor. xi. 4 ἀνὴρ κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων having (a veil hanging) down from his head; cf. also, in a tropical use, 2 Cor. viii. 2 ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία poverty reaching down to the depth.[1] It

[1] To the same head is to be referred also Acts xxvii. 14 ἔβαλε κατ' αὐτῆς ἄνεμος τυφωνικός. The tempestuous wind rushed (from above) *down upon* the island. In Mark xiv. 3 κατέχεεν αὐτοῦ κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς (holding the flask of ointment over his

400 passes from this to denote the level *over* (*through*) which something extends; and thus differs essentially from the local ἐν (with which by late writers it is often confounded, cf. Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 355), as in Luke iv. 14 ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου, Acts ix. 31, 42; x. 37, cf. Arrian. Alex. 5, 7, 1 and Indic. 13, 6.

Figuratively, it is applied to *hostile* movement directed *against* something, as in Matt. x. 35; xxvii. 1; Acts vi. 13; 1 Cor. iv. 6; xv. 15; Rom. viii. 33 (the opposite of ὑπέρ Rom. xi. 2; cf. viii. 34; 2 Cor xiii. 8); and is the preposition usually employed to express
358 this relation. Yet primarily it seems, like the German *gegen*, to
7th ed. denote merely *thitherwards;* while ἀντί, like *contra*, includes the notion of hostility in its local signification even. In *oaths* and *adjurations*, as in Matt. xxvi. 63; Heb. vi. 13, 16, κατὰ θεοῦ (Schaef. Long. p. 353 sq.; Bhdy. 238) probably means *down from God*, calling God down, so to speak, as witness or avenger (Krü. 294). Kühner II. 284 takes a different view.

342 1. Ὑπέρ, in its local signification, denotes the being *above* (over)
6th ed. a place (properly without immediate contact, Xen. M. 3, 8, 9 ὁ ἥλιος τοῦ θέρους ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν στεγῶν πορευόμενος, Herod. 2, 6, 19); hence in geographical diction the expression *situated above* a place, imminere urbi, Xen. A. 1, 10, 12; Thuc. 1, 137 (Dissen, Pind. p. 431). In the N. T. it is used only in a figurative sense:[1] and 1) most nearly approaching its local import in 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἵνα μὴ εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνὸς φυσιοῦσθε, if rendered: that one be not puffed up above the other (so that he fancy himself raised above the other); still related also to the local sense, 2) *to the advantage of, for the benefit of, for* (the opposite of κατά Mark ix. 40; Rom. viii. 31) any one (die, suffer, pray, care, exert one's self, etc., see
401 Benseler, Isocr. Areopag. p. 164 sq.) Jno. x. 15; xi. 50; Rom. v. 6; ix. 3 (cf. Xen. A. 7, 4, 9; Diod. Sic. 17, 15; Strabo 3, 165; Eurip. Alcest. 700, 711), Luke xxii. 19; 2 Cor. v. 21; Phil. iv. 10; Heb. v. 1; vii. 25; xiii. 17; Col. i. 7, 24, probably also 1 Cor. xv. 29,— originally as if bending *over* one to protect and defend him (cf.

head) good Codd. [Sin. also] omit the preposition. As to καταχέειν κατά τινος, see Plat. rep. 3, 398 a.; Apollod. 2, 7, 6.

[1] Unless 1 Cor xv. 29 βαπτίζεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν be rendered: cause themselves to be baptized *over the dead*. The passage can only be elucidated by antiquarian research. It is strange, however, that *Mey.* should declare the above explanation inadmissible because ὑπέρ occurs nowhere else in the N. T. in a *local* sense. Might not the preposition be used in this most simple local sense in *a single* passage only? The comment of *van Hengel*, Cor. p. 136, is worthy of attention, though it, too, contains an arbitrary restriction.

μάχεσθαι ὑπέρ τινος Xen. C. 2, 1, 21; Isocr. paneg. 14);[1] also εἶναι ὑπέρ τινος to be *for* one, Mark ix. 40; Rom. viii. 31; x. 1; Blume, Lycurg. p. 151. In most cases one who acts in behalf of another takes his place, 1 Tim. ii. 6; 2 Cor. v. 15; hence ὑπέρ is sometimes nearly equivalent to ἀντί *instead, loco* (see, especially, Eurip. Alcest. 700) Philem. 13 (Thuc. 1, 141; Polyb. 3, 67, 7).[2] 3) Ὑπέρ denotes the subject *on* (*over*) which one speaks, writes, decides, etc., Rom. ix. 27; Phil. i. 7; 2 Cor. viii. 23 (see Joel i. 3; Plutarch. Brut. 1; Mar. 3; Plat. Apol. 39 e.; legg. 6, 776; Demosth. 359
1. phil. p. 20 a.; Arrian. Al. 3, 3, 11; 6, 2, 6; Arrian. Epict. 1, 7th ed.
19, 26; Polyb. 1, 14, 1; Dion. H. V. 625; Aeschin. dial. 1, 8; Aelian. anim. 11, 20 and often), or *for*, in reference to, which one gives thanks, praise, Eph. i. 16; v. 20; Rom. xv. 9, *on* which one prides one's self, 2 Cor. vii. 4; ix. 2; xii. 5; 2 Thess. i. 4 (cf. in Latin *super*, in Hebrew עַל; the phrase *de* aliqua re loqui, too, is akin, see under περί);[3] hence in general, *with regard to* a matter, 343
e.g. 2 Cor. i. 6, 8; 2 Thess. ii. 1 ἐρωτῶμεν ὑμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῆς παρουσίας 6th ed.
τοῦ κυρίου (cf. Xen. C. 7, 1, 17 ὑπέρ τινος θαῤῥεῖν *to have full confidence in reference to one*). Akin to this is the causal signification *on account of, for the sake of*, 2 Cor. xii. 8 (Hebrew עַל, yet cf. Latin *gratia*, and Xen. C. 2, 2, 11, and even the German *für*, which often suits such passages and presents the same meaning under different aspects) Rom. xv. 8 ὑπὲρ ἀληθείας θεοῦ (Philostr. Apoll. 1, 35; Xen. A. 1, 7, 3, etc.), under which head come also Jno. xi. 4 ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ *for the glory of God, gloriae divinae* illustrandae *causa*, 2 Cor. xii. 19 ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν οἰκοδομῆς *for your* 402
edification, Rom. i. 5; 3 Jno. 7 and, with a difference of application, Phil. ii. 13 θεός ἐστιν ὁ ἐνεργῶν . . . ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐδοκίας *because of his benevolence*, in order to satisfy his benevolence. In 2 Cor. v. 20 ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν . . . δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, probably

[1] Hence properly different from περί, which simply means, *on account of one*, viewed as the object, the cause of the death, the prayer, etc.; see *Schaef.* Demosth. I. 189 sq.; cf. *Reitz*, Lucian. VI. 642; VII. 403 sq. ed. Lehm.; *Schoem.* Isae. p. 234; *Franke*, Demosth. p. 6 sq. In the Codd. of the N. T., however, as in Greek authors, the two prepositions are frequently interchanged, see on Gal. i. 4, Rom. i. 8, and the writers themselves do not adhere to the distinction. The two prepositions are appropriately used together in 1 Pet. iii. 18 (Eph. vi. 18). Cf. Thuc. 6, 78.

[2] Still, in doctrinal passages relating to Christ's death (Gal. iii. 13; Rom. v. 6, 8; xiv. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 18, etc.) it is not justifiable to render ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν and the like rigorously by *instead of* on account of such parallel passages as Matt. xx. 28 (*Fr.* Rom. I. 267). Ἀντί is the more definite of the two prepositions. Ὑπέρ signifies merely *for* men, for their deliverance; and leaves undetermined the precise sense in which Christ died *for* them.

[3] So with αἰσχύνεσθαι, ἀγανακτεῖν, etc. *Stallb.* Plat. Euthyd. p. 119.

ὑπέρ means both times (see de Wette in opposition to Mey.) *for* Christ i.e. in his name and behalf (consequently, in his stead), cf. Xen. C. 3, 3, 14; Plato Gorg. 515 c.; Polyb. 21, 14, 9; Marle floril. p. 169 sq., see above, no. 2) at the end. Others take the second ὑπέρ as in solemn asseverations (Bhdy. 244, whose explanation of this use, however, is assuredly erroneous) *by Christ*, per Christum. In Eph. vi. 20 the phrase πρεσβεύειν ὑπέρ is used in reference to a thing: to act as an ambassador *for* the gospel (in the cause of the gospel), cf. Dion. H. IV. 2044; Lucian. Toxar. 34.

§ 48. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE DATIVE.

a Ἐν.[1] 1) In its *local* signification (see Spohn, Niceph. Blemmid. p. 29 sqq.), this preposition refers to an expanse within the bounds of which anything exists. Hence, according to different conceptions of the relation, it signifies

360 a) First of all *in* or (when applied to surfaces, heights, etc.)
7th ed. *on*, Matt. xxiv. 40 ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, xx. 3 ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ, Luke xix. 36; Rev. iii. 21; Jno. iv. 20; 2 Cor. iii. 3. The same relation is frequently expressed by ἐπί with greater precision.

b) Then (of many) *among*, Matt. xi. 11; Acts ii. 29; iv. 34; xx. 25; Rom. i. 5; 1 Cor. v. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1; ii. 12. With this is connected ἐν denoting retinue, Luke xiv. 31 ἐν δέκα χιλιάσιν
403 ἀπαντῆσαι, Jude 14 (Neh. xiii. 2; 1 Sam. i. 24; 1 Macc. i. 17); as well as clothing (and armor, cf. Eph. vi. 16; Krebs, Obs. 26)
344 Matt. vii. 15; Mark xii. 38; Jno. xx. 12 (Aelian. 9, 34; Her. 2,
6th ed. 159; Callim. Dian. 241; Mtth. II. 1340). In a more general use ἐν is applied to that with which one is furnished, which he brings with him, Heb. ix. 25 εἰσέρχεται ἐν αἵματι, 1 Cor. iv. 21; v. 8; 2 Cor. x. 14; Rom. xv. 29 (Xen. C. 2, 3, 14).

c) Less strictly *in*, *at*, sometimes of direct cohesion, Jno. xv. 4 κλῆμα ἐὰν μὴ μείνῃ ἐν τῇ ἀμπέλῳ, sometimes of mere proximity (*by*, παρά), καθίζειν (εἶναι) ἐν δεξιᾷ θεοῦ *at* (*on*) *the right hand*, Heb. i. 3; viii. 1; Eph. i. 20; Plutarch. Lysand. 436 b.; Dio C. 216, 50

[1] Ἐν is used (apparently) with the Gen. in Heb. xi. 26, according to the reading admitted into the text by *Lchm.* from A and other Codd., τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν. Such constructions, by no means rare in Greek authors, must, as is well known, be considered as elliptical: ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου. Usually, however, only such words as ναός, ἑορτή, οἶκος are omitted; and in the passage in question there is a predominance of authority for τῶν Αἰγύπτου θησαυρῶν; [so Sin. also]. As to the most ancient use of this preposition (in Homer), see *Giseke* in *Schneidewin's* Philolog. VII. 77 ff.

(much more frequently thus used in Greek authors, Xen. C. 7, 1, 45; Isocr. panath. p. 646 and Philipp. p. 216; Plat. Charm. 153 b.; Diod. S. 4, 78; 17, 10, cf. comm. on Lucian. VI. 640 Lehm.; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 123).[1] On the other hand, it signifies *in* in Jno. x. 23 and Luke ii. 7, probably also in Jno. viii. 20, where γαζοφυλάκ. denotes the treasury as an apartment (or locality), and Luke xiii. 4, as it was usual to say *in* Siloam, because the fountain was surrounded with buildings; perhaps also Matt. xxvii. 5, see Mey. in loc. That in forms of quoting, as ἐν Δαυΐδ Heb. iv. 7; Rom. ix. 25 (*in* Cic. or. 71; Quint. 9, 4, 8) and even Rom. xi. 2 ἐν Ἠλίᾳ (see van Marle and Fr. in loc. cf. Diog. L. 6, 104), ἐν should be rendered by *in*, is obvious.

d) *Before*, *apud*, *coram* (Isocr. Archid. p. 276; Lysias pro mil. 11; Arrian. Epictet. 3, 22, 8; Ast, Plat. legg. 285), — a rendering, however, which is unnecessary in 1 Tim. iv. 15 (where, besides, πᾶσιν must be read without ἐν). This meaning, however, it bears in 1 Cor. ii. 6 (xiv. 11), see above, § 31, 8 (cf. Demosth. Boeot. p. 636 a.; Polyb. 17, 6, 1; 5, 29, 6; Appian. civ. 2, 137),[2] also 1 Cor. vi. 2 ἐν ὑμῖν κρίνεται ὁ κόσμος (in the orators ἐν ὑμῖν is often used thus for *apud vos*, *judices*, see Kypke in loc.), as well as ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς τιν. *before* one's eyes (*ante oc.*), see Palair. and 361
Elsner on Matt. xxi. 42 — a phrase used in this passage of the Sept. 7th ed.
figuratively.

2) By an easy transition ἐν is employed to denote *temporal* 404
relations, where we use sometimes *in*, sometimes *on* (e.g. of festivals) Matt. xii. 2; Jno. ii. 23, sometimes *at* (with a substantive denoting an event) Matt. xxii. 28; 1 Pet. i. 7, also 1 Cor. xv. 52 ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ σάλπιγγι *at* the last trumpet (as soon as it sounds), 1 Thess. iv. 16; Heb. iii. 8, and with the Inf. of verbs, Matt. xiii. 25; Luke ix. 36; xvii. 11. Where it signifies *within* (Wex, Soph. Antig. p. 167) Jno. ii. 19 it may also be rendered by *in* (Her. 2, 29), and differs then obviously from διά; for ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις (Plato

[1] To render ἐν ᾗ in Heb. ix. 4 by *juxta* quam, would be to favor archæology at the expense of grammar. Where ἐν in a local sense is joined to personal names (in the Plur.), it signifies not so much *with* as *among*, *in the midst of*, (a number, a company, etc.). As to 1 Pet. v. 2 τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον, *Pott's* rendering is quite admissible: *the flock existing in the countries where you reside* (cf. διά Rom. xv. 28). Grammatically it would be possible also to join τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν to ποιμάνατε (quantum in vobis est, as much as in you lies), or, which would undoubtedly be far-fetched, to render τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ποίμνιον *the flock entrusted to you*, as εἶναι, κεῖσθαι ἔν τινι means, *to rely on*, *depend on*, *one*.

[2] In explaining 1 Cor. as above, *Rückert* pronounces ἐν ἐμοί exactly the same as ἐμοί — one of those superficial remarks which, so nakedly stated, one could hardly have expected from a scholar at the present day.

345 Menex. 240 b.) does not mean that three whole days are to be
6th ed. spent on something, but only that something is to take place *within* that space of time, consequently before its expiration. Cf. besides, *ἐν ᾧ while, during the time that*, Jno. v. 7; Mark ii. 19; Thuc. 6, 55; Plato Theaet. 190 c.; Soph. Trach. 925 (*ἐν τούτῳ interea* Xen. C. 1, 3, 17; 3, 2, 12), *ἐν οἷς during which* Luke. xii. 1. Closely related to the *temporal* signification is the *ἐν* of subsistence (i.e. positive and continued existence) Heb. vi. 18 *ἐν οἷς ἀδύνατον ψεύσασθαι θεόν whereupon*, these two assurances being matters of fact, etc., Rom. ii. 12 *ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον under* (during the existence, while in possession, of) *the law;* — also of condition, Luke viii. 43 *γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ῥύσει αἵματος*, Rom. iv. 10; Phil. iv. 11 (see Elsner in loc.; Kühner II. 274), and that, too, inward, Luke iv. 36; Tit. i. 6, particularly of the state of mind or feeling, 1 Tim. ii. 2; 2 Cor. ii. 1; viii. 2; Luke i. 44, 75; Eph. i. 4 (Heb. xi. 2); 2 Pet. ii. 3; lastly, — the *ἐν* of occupation, 1 Tim. iv. 15 *ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι*, Col. iv. 2 cf. Eph. vi. 20 (Mey. in loc.), neut. *ἐν οἷς* Acts xxvi. 12. Cf. Xen. C. 3, 1, 1; 5, 2, 17; Soph. Oed. R. 570; Plato Phaed. 59 a. and Stallb. in loc.

3) The figurative use of *ἐν*, to which we have already made some incidental reference, is extremely diversified, perceptibly exhibiting the progressive deterioration of the language as well as a Hebrew coloring. For *ἐν* is used to indicate not merely that in which something else is (ideally) contained, consists, appears 1 Pet. iii. 4; Eph. iv. 3 (ii. 15), 2 Thess. ii. 9 (1 Cor. xi. 25), Phil. i. 9, but also, with great variety of application,

a) The basis *on* which, or the sphere (range, personal or impersonal) *in* which, some power acts, 1 Cor. ix. 15 *ἵνα οὕτω* (vs. 13 f.) *γένηται ἐν ἐμοί* that it should be so done *on me* (in my case), iv. 2,
405 6 *ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε* learn *in* us, Jno. xiij. 35 *ἐν τούτῳ γνώσονται*, Xen. C. 1, 6, 41 (Luke xxiv. 35; 1 Jno. iii. 19), Rom. xiv. 22 *ὁ μὴ κρίνων ἐν ᾧ* (*ἐν τούτῳ ὅ*) *δοκιμάζει*, 1 Thess. v. 12 *κοπιῶντες ἐν ὑμῖν* who labor *upon* you, Rom. i. 9 *λατρεύειν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* (1 Thess. iii. 2 *συνεργὸς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ* var.), 1 Cor. vii. 15; to denote an ethical relation, 2 Cor. iv. 2 *περιπατοῦντες ἐν πανουργίᾳ* (Eph. ii. 3,
362 10: v. 2), Rom. vi. 2 *ζῆν ἐν ἁμαρτίᾳ* (Fr. in loc.), Col. iii. 7 (Cic.
7th ed. fam. 9, 26), cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Jno. ii. 8; in a more extended sense, of the object *in* (*on, at*) which one rejoices, glories etc., *χαίρειν, καυχᾶσθαι, ἐν* see § 33 p. 232.

b) The measure or standard (Thuc. 1. 77; 8, 89) *in, according to*, which something is executed, Eph. iv. 16 (Heb. iv. 11), cf. the

Hebrew בְּ. Many understand it so in Heb. x. 10 ἐν ᾧ θελήματι ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν *according*, in conformity, *to which will*. Here, however, ἐν is more precise than κατά: It is founded *in* the will of God, that we are sanctified through Christ's sacrificial death. In no other passage does the meaning *secundum* occur, although even the most recent N. T. Lexicons give copious examples in support of it. Ἐν ἐμοί *according to my judgment*, 1 Cor. xiv. 11, is properly: *to me* (in my conception) cf. Wex, Antig. p. 187. In Rom. i. 24; viii. 15; xi. 25 (var.); Phil. ii. 7 ἐν denotes condition. 1 Thess. iv. 15 may be translated: *this I say unto you in a word of the Lord*, cf. 1 Cor. ii. 7; xiv. 6. In περιπατεῖν ἐν σοφίᾳ 346
and similar phrases, σοφία is not represented as a rule *according* 6th ed.
to which, but as an ideal possession, or even a sphere *within* which to walk (see above). To understand ἐν Χριστῷ, ἐν κυρίῳ, as meaning *according to the will or example of Christ*, would be to take a flat view of the apostle's conception. Lastly, 1 Tim. i. 18 ἵνα στρατεύῃ ἐν αὐταῖς (ταῖς προφητείαις) τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν is probably to be interpreted, conformably to the figure, *in* prophesyings, equipped with them so to speak (as the actual warrior is *in arms*).

c) The (external) occasion, Acts vii. 29 ἔφυγεν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ *at* (*on*) *this saying*, Xen. equestr. 9, 11; hence sometimes the ground, cause, Matt. vi. 7 ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται *on account of* their much speaking (properly *on* their etc.), cf. Aelian. anim. 11, 31; Dio C. 25, 5, and ἐν τούτῳ Jno. xvi. 30 *therefore*,[1] probably also 1 Cor. iv. 4 (cf. Plutarch. glor. Athen. c. 7 ἐν τούτοις); ἐν ᾧ (for ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι) *because* Rom. viii. 3 see Fr. In 406
many languages, however, a concomitant is assigned thus as a *cause:* in Latin, *propter* strictly means *near;* and the German *weil* (because) is properly a particle of time (during). Ἐν in

[1] In Heb. xi. 2 ἐν ταύτῃ (τῇ πίστει) denotes not the ground, but the (ideal) possession: *in hac* (*constituti*), cf. 1 Tim. v. 10 (Jno. viii. 21). In Heb. ii. 18 ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν is undoubtedly to be resolved by ἐν τούτῳ ὅ *in eo quod*, see above p. 159. This same meaning occurs in 1 Pet. ii. 12. In Heb. vi. 17 ἐν ᾧ may be referred to ὅρκος preceding, though (as sometimes ἐφ' ᾧ) the rendering *quapropter*, *quare*, would not be inappropriate. In Rom. ii. 1 ἐν ᾧ may be rendered *dum*, or better, with the Vulgate, *in quo* (in qua re) judicas etc., which gives a sense quite in point, cf. *Fr.* In Luke x. 20 ἐν τούτῳ . . . ὅτι means, *at this* (rejoice) *that*, cf. Phil. i. 18. I am not aware of there being in any Greek author an unquestionable instance of ἐν τούτῳ, ἐν ᾧ, in the sense of *therefore*, *because*. The passages adduced in *Sturz*, Lexic. Xenoph. II. 162, admit of another meaning. Xen. A. 1, 3, 1 — a passage which *Kypke*, II. 194, refers to this head — has in the best editions ἐπὶ τούτῳ. Likewise Plat. rep. 5, 455 b., where *Ast* explains ἐν ᾧ by *propterea quod*, is susceptible of another exposition; see *Stallb.* in loc.

363 the sense of *propter* is never joined to names of persons (see my 7th ed. Comment. ad Gal. i. 24, cf. Exod. xiv. 4);[1] and in general too many passages have been referred to this head, as Eph. iii. 13; Jno. viii. 21; Jas. i. 25; 2 Cor. vi. 12; Heb. iv. 11.

d) The instrument and means (principally in the Rev.), not merely (as in the better Greek prose authors, see Bttm. Philoct p. 69; Boeckh, Pind. III. 487; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 195, and the uncritical collections in Schwarz, Comment. p. 476; Georgi, Vind. 153 sq.) where the German *in* also (or *auf*) is admissible, as καίειν
347 ἐν πυρί Rev. xvii. 16 (1 Cor. iii. 13), cf. 1 Macc. v. 44; vi. 31 6th ed. (δῆσαι ἐν πέδαις Xen. A. 4, 3, 8; cf. Judg. xv. 13; xvi. 7; Sir. xxviii. 19; Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 104, καλύπτειν ἐν ἱματίῳ Ael. anim. 11, 15), μετρεῖν ἐν μέτρῳ Matt. vii. 2, ἁλίζειν ἐν ἅλατι Matt. v. 13; Rev. vii. 14; Jas. iii. 9; Heb. ix. 22, but also, through the influence of the Hebrew בְּ, in circumstances quite different from this, where in Greek authors the Dative would be employed alone as the casus instrumentalis, as Luke xxii. 49 πατάσσειν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ, Rev. vi. 8 ἀποκτεῖναι ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ, xiii. 10; xiv. 15 κράζειν ἐν μεγάλῃ φωνῇ (2 Pet. ii. 16), Matt. vii. 6 καταπατεῖν ἐν τοῖς ποσίν, Luke i. 51; Mark
407 xiv. 1; Rom. xv. 6, especially in the Rev. (cf. Judg. iv. 16; xv. 15; xx. 16, 48; 1 Kings xii. 18; Josh. x. 35; Exod. xiv. 21; xvi. 3; xvii. 5, 13; xix. 13; Gen. xxxii. 20; xli. 36; xlviii. 22; Neh. i. 10; 1 Macc. iv. 15; Judith ii. 19; v. 9; vi. 4, 12, etc.).[2] Yet such constructions occasionally occur even in Greek authors; as, Himer. eclog. 4, 16 ἐν ξίφει, Hippocr aphor. 2, 36 ἐν φαρμακείῃσι καθαί-
364 ρεσθαι, Malal. 2 p. 50.[3] Ἐν is so used with personal designations, 7th ed.

[1] In 2 Cor. xiii. 4 ἀσθενοῦμεν ἐν αὐτῷ, as frequently ἐν Χριστῷ (so variously understood by expositors), denotes fellowship with Christ, the relation of εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ (see below, p. 389). The apostle is not weak *for Christ's sake* (out of regard as it were for the interest of Christ, to prevent the possible falling away of the Corinthians); but weak *in Christ*, i.e. *in* and conformably to (apostolic) fellowship with Christ (who likewise was in a certain sense ἀσθενής; see what precedes). The phrase designates concisely a state which results from *being in Christ*; just as the ζῆν and δυνατὸν εἶναι are referred to fellowship with Christ (σύν). Just as little does Eph. iv. 1 ὁ δέσμιος ἐν κυρίῳ mean *the prisoner for Christ's sake*. Somewhat more remote is Phil. i. 8 ἐπιποθῶ πάντας ὑμᾶς ἐν σπλάγχνοις Χριστοῦ Ἰ., see *Bengel*.

[2] It would be a mistake to suppose that in Eph. ii. 15 (§ 31, note 1, p. 220) and vi. 4 ἐν denotes the instrument. In the latter passage παιδεία καὶ νουθεσία κυρίου is the sphere *in* which the children are trained, cf. Polyb. 1, 65, 7. Even in the expression ἀλλάσσειν τι ἔν τινι Rom. i. 23, I cannot with *Fr.* adopt the meaning *per*, nor do I think that the Hebrew בְּ with חָמִיר is to be so understood. *To change something in gold* is either an abbreviated expression, or gold is conceived as that *in* which the exchange is effected. The ἐν of price is similar; see above and p. 390.

[3] Many passages that might be adduced under this head from Greek authors, are to

Matt. ix. 34 ἐν τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια, Acts xvii. 31 κρίνειν ἐν ἀνδρί *in* a man, cf. Thuc. 7, 8, 2; Mtth. II. 1341, not Jno. xvii. 10; 2 Thess. i. 10, or by any means Acts xvii. 28.[1] The phrase ὀμόσαι ἔν τινι Matt. v. 34 ff. does not signify jurare *per* 348
(see Fr. in loc.), but more simply: swear *by* (*on*) something. So 6ta ed. 408
likewise in other passages ἐν does not properly signify *through*: 1 Cor. vii. 14 ἡγίασται ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἄπιστος ἐν τῇ γυναικί means, he is sanctified *in* the wife, — the foundation rather than the means of sanctification being indicated. In Rom. xv. 16 ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ and not διὰ πν. ἁγ. is employed designedly, *in* the Holy Spirit (an internal principle). Related to this is 1 Cor. xv. 22 ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσι, Acts iv. 2 ἐν Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν καταγγέλλειν. Least of all does ἐν Χριστῷ (κυρίῳ) ever signify *per* Chr. (Fr. Rom. I. 397, the precise expression for which is διὰ Ἰησ. Χρ.), Rom. vi. 11 ζῶντες τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χρ. Ἰ. (the Christian lives not merely through Christ, beneficio Christi, but *in* Christ, in soul-nourishing fellowship with Christ), vi. 23; 2 Cor. ii. 14; but this phrase invariably refers, for the most part in an abbre-

be otherwise explained, as ὁρᾶν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς Lucian. Phalar. 1, 5, ἐν ὄμμασιν ὑποβλέπειν Lucian. amor. 29 (cf. *Wex*, Antig. I. 270), Porphyr. de antro Nymphar. p. 261 ἀμφορέων, ἐν οἷς ... ἀρυόμεθα, Lucian. asin. 44 ὡς τεθνηκὼς ἐν ταῖς πληγαῖς (*under* the blows), Plat. Tim. 81 c. τεθραμμένης ἐν γάλακτι brought up *on* milk (cf *Jacobs*, Athen. p. 57). In Lucian. conscr. hist. 12 for ἐν ἀκοντίῳ φονεύειν recent editors on the authority of MSS. give ἑνὶ ἀκ. φ.; on the other hand, in Lucian. dial. mort. 23, 3 all the Codd. but *one* have καθικόμενον ἐν τῇ ῥάβδῳ (not so Ael. 2, 6), yet *Lehmann* considers the preposition even in this passage as suspicious (cf. Lucian. Lapith. c. 26). See, besides, *Engelhardt*, Plat. Menex. p. 261; *Dissen*, Pind. p. 487.

[1] In Jno. xvii. 10 δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς undoubtedly signifies more than δι' αὐτῶν. He would have been glorified *through them*, if they had merely accomplished some external achievement conducive to the glory of Christ; he is glorified *in them*, in so far as they in their own persons, *in themselves*, glorify Christ. In the same way to live and have one's being *in God*, appears to express man's subsistence, his being rooted as it were, in the divine power, with greater precision than could be done by διά. When ἐν and διά are joined together in one and the same sentence, διά expresses thus the external means, while ἐν points to what was wrought *in* or *on* one's person, and as it were cleaves to him, Eph. i. 7 ἐν ᾧ (Χριστῷ) ἔχομεν τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ (where *Mey.* is wrong), iii. 6. Even when things, and not persons, are in question, the distinction between ἐν (referring to mental states or powers) and διά (of the means) is perceptible; as, 1 Pet. i. 5 τοὺς ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ φρουρουμένους διὰ πίστεως, see *Steiger* in loc., i. 22 ἡγνικότες ἐν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας διὰ πνεύματος, Heb. x. 10. Lastly, passages in which ἐν and διά in reference to things are interchanged in the same proposition, Col. i. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 4 ff. 8; 1 Cor. xiv. 19, merely show that both prepositions are identical as respects *the sense*. Even ἐν in Matt. iv. 4 ἐν παντὶ ῥήματι does not appear to be exactly equivalent to ἐπί in ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ; but the latter (ἐπί) denotes the basis, ἐν the (spiritual) element, of life. At all events, *through* or *by means of* would be an inaccurate translation.

viated way, to the *being in Christ* εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Thess. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 1; xvi. 11; 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. i. 22), and Luther's "barbarous" translation (Fr. II. 85)[1] is to be retained. So likewise in 1 Cor. xii. 3 ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ λαλῶν is to be rendered quite
365 literally, *speaking in the Spirit of God*, the element in which the
7th ed. speaker lives (Rom. ix. 1; xiv. 17; Col. i. 8).

e) The price, after the analogy of the Hebrew, Rev. v. 9 ἀγοράζειν ἐν τῷ αἵματι (1 Chron. xxi. 24). The value of the thing purchased is contained *in* the price (to which the ἐκ of the price then corresponds).

Even in the most recent Lexicons the significations of this preposition have been unwarrantably multiplied or its real significations incorrectly applied to passages of the N. T. The interpretations which have been given to the phrase ἐν ὀνόματί τινος in particular are Protean. The ἐν here causes no difficulty, for it simply means *in*. And something takes place 'in a person's name' when it is comprehended or embraced in his name, is to be set down to his personal activity, cf. Acts iv. 7 (not to his who is the nearest, the immediate, subject, cf. Jno. v. 43). Only the various verbs which are limited by ἐν ὀνόματι require the expositor's attention, in order that the various senses may be traced back severally in the simplest manner to the literal meaning of the phrase. This task has not yet been performed satisfactorily (yet better by Harless, Eph. S. 484, than by van Hengel, Philip. p. 161 sq.), not even by Mey. Phil. ii. 10 seems to require separate treatment: ὄνομα here refers to ὄνομα in vs. 9, and ἐν ὀνόματι denotes the name upon which those that bow the knee unite, on which united all (πᾶν γόνυ) worship. The name which Jesus has received moves all to united adoration. In Tit. iii. 5 ἐν does not indicate the *finis* or *consilium;* but ἔργα τὰ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ mean, works performed in the
409 spirit of a δίκαιος; as to Luke i. 17; 1 Cor. vii. 15 see below. In Mark ix. 50 εἰρηνεύετε ἐν ἀλλήλοις, the rendering *erga* is not necessary; we, too,

[1] In so far as the Christian abides (by faith) in living (inward, hence ἐν) fellowship with Christ, he will do everything in the consciousness of this fellowship, and through the strength which this fellowship confers, i.e. *in* Christ, *in* the Lord; *as a Christian, in a Christian spirit*, etc., as the words are frequently rendered, expresses much less than the pregnant phrase *in Christ*. So in Rom. xvi. 12 *who labor in the Lord*, conscious of their fellowship with the Lord (unworldly κοπιᾶν is meant), 1 Cor. xv. 18 *who fell asleep in Christ*, in conscious, steadfast fellowship with Christ (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 16; Rev. xiv. 13), Rom. ix. 1 (a passage which even *Bengel* misunderstood) *speak the truth in Christ* (as one living in Christ), xiv. 14 *persuaded in the Lord* (of a truth of which one in living union with Christ is assured). As to 1 Cor. iv. 15 see *Mey.* In the same way εὑρίσκεσθαι ἐν Χρ. Phil. iii. 9 is to be explained. See besides, Rom. xv. 17; xvi. 2, 22; 1 Cor. vii. 39; Phil. iv. 1 (Eph. vi. 1), 1 Pet. v. 10. *Fr.* Rom. II. 82 sqq. is essentially right, though his remarks are not free from misapprehensions nor from unnecessary matter See, besides, *v. Hengel*, Cor. p. 81.

say: *among* (one another) *yourselves*. The following interpretations appear still more inadmissible:

a. *ex*,[1] Heb. xiii. 9 ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες *unde* (Schott) nihil commodi perceperunt (cf. ὠφελεῖσθαι ἀπό Aeschin. dial. 2, 11). If ἐν 349
οἷς is to be joined to ὠφελήθ., the preposition indicates the profit that would 6th ed.
have originated *therein* or attached *thereto*, Xen. Athen. rep. 1, 3; Demosth. Pantaen. 631 a.; but ἐν οἷς belongs to περιπατήσαντες. Matt. i. 20 τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν means, that which has been begotten *in her* (*in ejus utero*).

b. *pro, loco*, Rom. xi. 17 (Schott) ἐνεκεντρίσθης ἐν αὐτοῖς (κλάδοις) means: 366
grafted *on* the branches (of which some had been cut off). 7th ed.

c. *with*. In Acts xx. 32 ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις signifies, *among* (with) *the sanctified*. Acts vii. 14 μετεκαλέσατο τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ Ἰακὼβ ... ἐν ψυχαῖς ἑβδομ. means, (consisting) *in* seventy souls; בְּ is used in the same way in Deut. x. 22; I do not, however, know of an instance in a Greek author. Fr.'s explanation of these words (ad Mr. p. 604) appears to me too far-fetched, and it has been rejected by Wahl also. In Eph. vi. 2 ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐντολὴ πρώτη ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ undoubtedly means not merely, *annexa, addita promissione*, but *the first in promise*, i.e. in point of promise (not ἐν τάξει Chrysost.). So also Mey.

d. *by* (*of*). In Eph. iv. 21 εἴγε ἐν αὐτῷ ἐδιδάχθητε *if ye were taught in him* is closely connected with ἀποθέσθαι etc. following, and consequently means, conformably to fellowship with Christ, as believers in Christ.

As to ἐν for εἰς, see § 50, no. 4, p. 413 sq.

b. *Σύν with* as distinguished from μετά indicates a more intimate union;[2] as, among persons, partnership in calling, faith, fortune, etc. Acts ii. 14; xiv. 4, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 32. Hence it is generally used in reference to spiritual fellowship, as that of believers with Christ, Rom. vi. 8; Col. ii. 13, 20; iii. 3; 1 Thess. iv. 17; v. 10; or that of believers with Abraham, Gal. iii. 9 (σύν denoting in all these cases not mere resemblance, but actual association). Then in reference to things it denotes powers combining and co-operating *with* a person, 1 Cor. v. 4; xv. 10. It would be extended to a less intimate connection in 2 Cor. viii. 19 *with* the collection; yet here ἐν seems the preferable reading. On 410
the other hand, cf. Luke xxiv. 21 σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον *along with all this*, i.e. *joined to all this is the additional fact that* etc. (Neh. v. 18; cf. Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 5).

[1] *Fischer*, Weller. p. 141, adopts this meaning even for πίνειν ἐν ἀργύρῳ, χρυσῷ etc. (Isocr. paneg. c. 30; Diog. L. 1, 104, bibere *in* ossibus Flor. 3, 4, 2). With equal reason might it be asserted that in German *auf* is the same as *von* because we say *auf* silbernen Tellern essen, which, according to the analogy of '*aus* silbernen Bechern trinken,' is equivalent to '*von* silbernen Tellern.'

[2] *Krü.* 287 "σύν τινι denotes rather *coherence*; μετά τινος, rather *co-existence*."

c. *Ἐπί.* The primary, local, import is *upon, above,* (applied both to heights and plains):[1] Matt. xiv. 11 *ἠνέχθη ἡ κεφαλὴ ἐπὶ πίνακι*, Mark i. 45 *ἐπ' ἐρήμοις τόποις* (see above, *ἐπί* with Gen.; cf. *ἀνάγειν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον* Matt. iv. 1), vi. 39; Luke xxi. 6; Rev. xix. 14, also Jno. iv. 6 *ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ on* (at) the well (the rim of the well rises above the well itself), Rev. ix. 14 (Xen. An. 1, 2, 350 8; 5, 3, 2; Cyr. 7, 5, 11; Isocr. paneg. c. 40; Dio C. 177, 30; see 5th ed. above, § 47 g.).[2] Sometimes it signifies *at* (*on*) Jno. v. 2 *ἐπὶ τῇ* 367 *προβατικῇ at the sheep-gate*, Acts iii. 10, 11; Matt. xxiv. 33 *ἐπὶ* 7th ed. *θύραις* (Xen. C. 8, 1, 33, yet see note [3] p. 374); it is applied also in this sense to persons, Acts v. 35 *πράσσειν τι ἐπί τινι* inflict something *on* one (do something *to*), cf. *δρᾶν τι ἐπί τινι* Her. 3, 14; Ael. anim. 11, 11. Lastly, it signifies (*contiguity*) *at, with* either in reference to place (*apud*) Acts xxviii. 14 *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἐπιμεῖναι*, or to time Heb. ix. 26 *ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων sub finem mundi;* and so Phil. i. 3 *εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ μνείᾳ ὑμῶν on every remembrance of you*, Mark vi. 52 *οὐ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις*, 2 Cor. ix. 6 *σπείρειν, θερίζειν ἐπ' εὐλογίαις with* blessings, so that blessings attend; and in another application in Heb. ix. 15 *τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων with* (under) *the first covenant* (during the existence of the first covenant). In this sense it is applied also to persons, Heb. x. 28 (Sept.) *ἐπὶ τρισὶ μάρτυσι with* (before) *three witnesses, adhibitis testibus.* It likewise indicates what is closely connected (in time), what follows *on* some event, Xen. C. 2, 3, 7 *ἀνέστη ἐπ' αὐτῷ Φεραύλας directly after* (Appian. civ. 5, 3; Paus. 7, 25, 6; Dio C. 325, 89, and 519, 99; cf. Wurm, Dinarch. p. 39 sq.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 30). Some explain in this way Acts xi. 19 *ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως τῆς γενομένης ἐπὶ Στεφάνῳ* (see Alberti in loc.); but *ἐπί* there means rather *over* (on account of) or *against* (Matthäi in loc.), cf. Schaef. Plutarch. V. 17; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 288.

411 *Figuratively ἐπί* denotes, in general, the foundation *on* which an action or state rests, Phil. iii. 9; so in Matt. iv. 4 *ζῆν ἐπ' ἄρτῳ* Sept. (corresponding to *ἐν ῥήματι*) after the Hebrew חָיָה עַל Deut.

[1] According to *Krü.* 303 *ἐπί* with Gen. indicates rather an accidental and more loose connection; *ἐπί* with Dat., the notion of belonging to.

[2] The signification *upon* is perceptible also in Luke xii. 53 *ἔσονται ... πατὴρ ἐφ' υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί* the father will be *upon him*, that is, as a load, oppressing, agreeably to the vulgar idiom; cf. the German, Vater und Sohn liegen sich auf dem Halse. *Against*, however, here expresses the meaning correctly. I cannot, however, decide with *Wahl* to apply the same meaning to Luke xxiii. 38. Rom. x. 19 is of quite a different sort.

viii. 3 (though it is thus used also in Greek authors, Plato Alcib. 1, 105 c.; Alciph. 3, 7; cf. *sustentare vitam*). Here belongs also ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί τινος (Lucian. pisc. 15; cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 463 sq.) to do something *upon* the name of some one, i.e. in doing it to rely upon, or have reference to, the name of some one. The expression has various applications in the N. T.: ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησ. Χρ. *to teach upon* (in) *the name of Christ* (Luke xxiv. 47; Acts iv. 17; v. 28, 40), i.e. by referring to him as the source of doctrine and authority; *to cast out demons upon* (in) *the name of Christ*, Luke ix. 49, i.e. making the efficacy of the exorcising depend on his name (uttered on the occasion as a solemn form); *baptism upon* (in) *the name of Christ* is baptism founded on the acknowledgment of his name, Acts ii. 38; *to receive any one upon* (in) *the name of Christ*, Matt. xviii. 5, i.e. because he bears his name, confesses him, etc.

Special senses of ἐπί are

a) *Over*, of superintendence, Luke xii. 44 ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπάρχουσι καταστήσει αὐτόν, cf. Xen. C. 6, 3, 28 (as elsewhere with Gen. Lob. Phryn. p. 474 sq.).

b) *Over*, *to*, of addition to something already existing, Luke iii. 20 προσέθηκε καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσι, Matt. xxv. 20 ἄλλα πέντε τάλαντα ἐκέρδησα ἐπ' αὐτοῖς in addition to those five talents (if ἐπ' 351
αὐτοῖς is genuine), Luke xvi. 26 ἐπὶ πᾶσι τούτοις *besides*, *over and* 6th ed.
above, *all this*, Lucian. conscr. hist. 31; Aristoph. plut. 628 (cf. Wetsten. and Kypke in loc.), Phil. ii. 17; Col. iii. 14; Eph. vi. 16 (cf. Polyb. 6, 23, 12). Hence in Jno. iv. 27 ἐπὶ τούτῳ ἦλθον οἱ 368
μαθηταί *upon this*, as Jesus spoke thus with etc., came the dis- 7th ed.
ciples. It is used somewhat differently in 2 Cor. vii. 13 ἐπὶ τῇ παρακλήσει περισσοτέρως μᾶλλον ἐχάρημεν *besides my consolation*, *I rejoiced*, etc.

c) *Over*, of the object after verbs denoting an emotion, as θαυμάζειν, ἀγαλλιᾶν, πενθεῖν, λυπεῖσθαι, ὀργίζεσθαι, [μακροθυμεῖν], μετανοεῖν, Luke i. 47; xviii. 7; Mark iii. 5; xii. 17; Matt. vii. 28; Rom. x. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 21; Rev. xii. 17; xviii. 11 (Plat. symp. 217 a. and 206 b.; Isocr. paneg. 22; Lucian. philops. 14; Aristot. rhet. 2, 10, 1; Palaeph. 1, 8; Joseph. antt. 5, 1, 26 a.). With εὐχαριστεῖν it signifies to give thanks *over* (for), 1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Cor. ix. 15; Phil. i. 3 sq.; Polyb. 18, 26, 4. It is also employed with verbs of speaking, Rev. x. 11 προφητεῦσαι ἐπὶ λαοῖς (xxii. 16 var.), Jno. xii. 16 ταῦτα ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένα (Her. 1, 66; Paus. 3, 13, 3; 412
cf. Schoemann, Plut. Agis p. 71).

d) *On*, of a supposition or condition (Xen. symp. 1, 5; Diod. S. 2, 24; Lucian. conscr. hist. 38; Aesop. 21, 1): ἐπ' ἐλπίδι *on* (in) hope, 1 Cor. ix. 10 (Plat. Alcib. 1, 105 b., ἐπ' ἐλπίσι Dio Chr. 1003, 21; Herod. 3, 12, 20), Heb. ix. 17 ἐπὶ νεκροῖς (*on* one's death) after men are dead, when death has taken place.[1] It is used also of motive, Luke v. 5 ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὸ δίκτυον *on* thy word, induced by thy word, Acts iii. 16 ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει *on account of* the faith, xxvi. 6; Matt. xix. 9 (1 Cor. viii. 11 var.);[2] cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 14, 2; Cyr. 1, 3, 16; 1, 4, 24; 4, 5, 14; Her. 1, 137; Lucian. Hermot. 80; Isocr. areop. 336; Dio Chr. 29, 293. Hence ἐφ' ᾧ *wherefore, on which account*, Diod. S. 19, 98 (ἐφ' ᾧπερ Dio C. 43, 95, etc.), and *because* 2 Cor. v. 4; Rom. v. 12; probably also Phil. iii. 12 (*on this account that*, for ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι see Fr. Rom. I. 299 sq.), *eo quod*.[3]

e) *To, for*, of aim and issue, 1 Thess. iv. 7 οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ *to uncleanness*, Gal. v. 13 (like καλεῖν ἐπὶ ξενίᾳ Xen. An. 7, 6, 3, and the like; see Sintenis, Plutarch. Them. p. 147), 2 Tim. ii. 14; Eph. ii. 10, cf. Xen. An. 5, 7, 34; Mem. 2, 3, 19; Plat. rep. 8, 389 b.; Diod. S. 2, 24; Arrian. Alex. 1, 26, 4; 2, 18, 9; Diog. L. 1, 7, 2; cf. Index to Dio C. ed. Sturz p. 148 sq., according to some ἐφ' ᾧ Phil. iii. 12 *unto which* (for which).

f) *After*, of the rule, model, Luke i. 59 καλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι after the name (Neh. vii. 63). To this head, probably, belongs
352 also Rom. v. 14 ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδάμ *ad* (Vulg.
6th ed. *in*) *similitudinem* peccati Ad.; for other explanations, see Meyer.
369 2 Cor. ix. 6, however, we cannot with Philippi (Röm.-Br. S. 172)
7th ed. understand in the same way; see above, p. 392.

When ἐπί with Dat. in a local sense is joined to a verb of direction or motion (Matt. ix. 16; Jno. viii. 7, not Matt. xvi. 18; Acts iii. 11), the phrase
413 includes together with the idea of motion that of tarrying and resting also.

d. *Παρά beside* i.e. properly *near, at the side of*, used of place, with the Dative of the thing only in Jno. xix. 25 (Soph. Oed. C.

[1] Yet several of these passages may be referred to the more general signification *at, with* (see above), as is done by *Fr.* Rom. I. 315.

[2] Ἀπολεῖται ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἀδελφὸς ἐπὶ τῇ σῇ γνώσει (where, however, good authorities [Sin also] read ἐν) is, properly, perishes *on thy knowledge* i.e. because thy knowledge is urged, — briefly, *through* thy knowledge. But ἐπί does not therefore, as *Grotius* Rom. v. 12 maintains, strictly mean *through*.

[3] The Greeks usually employ the Plural, ἐφ' οἷς (but ἐπὶ τῷδε *Ellendt*, Arrian. Al. I. 211). *Rothe* (Versuch über Röm. v. 12 ff. p. 17 ff.) has recently asserted that in the N. T. this ἐφ' ᾧ should be uniformly rendered *on the supposition, on the understanding, on condition, that, in as far as*. There is no passage, however, in which this would not be artificial and forced; cf. *Rückert*, Comment. zu Röm. 2 Aufl. I. 262.

1160; Plato Ion 535 b.), elsewhere with the Dat. of the person (Krü. 299); sometimes denoting

a) What is externally *near*, *by*, *with*, Luke ix. 47, or what is in one's vicinity, province, custody, 2 Tim. iv. 13 φελόνην ἀπέλιπον παρὰ Κάρπῳ, 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Aristot. pol. 1, 7), Luke xix. 7 (where παρὰ ἁμαρτ. belongs to καταλῦσαι), Col. iv. 16; Rev. ii. 13; Acts x. 6; xviii. 3. Sometimes, and more frequently,

b) In reference to what is *ideally near* one, in one's possession, power, capacity, etc. (*penes*); as, Matt. xix. 26 παρὰ ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν, παρὰ δὲ θεῷ πάντα δυνατά, Rom. ii. 11 οὐ γάρ ἐστι προσωποληψία παρὰ θεῷ, ix. 14; Luke i. 37 (παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ is a clerical mistake) cf. Demosth. cor. 352 a. εἴ ἐστι παρ' ἐμοί τις ἐμπειρία, Jas. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17, especially of the judgment, Acts xxvi. 8 τί ἄπιστον κρίνεται παρ' ὑμῖν etc. (apud vos), Rom. xii. 16 μὴ γίνεσθε φρόνιμοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς (Prov. iii. 7) before yourselves (as judges), in your own estimation, in your own eyes, 1 Cor. iii. 19; 2 Pet. iii. 8 (Her. 1, 32; Plato Theaet. 170 d.; Soph. Trach. 586; Eurip. Bacch. 399, and Electr. 737; Bhdy. 257). So likewise 2 Pet. ii. 11 οὐ φέρουσι κατ' αὐτῶν παρὰ κυρίῳ (before the Lord as Judge) βλάσφημον κρίσιν were the words π. κυρ. genuine, and, substantially, 1 Cor. vii. 24 ἕκαστος ἐν ᾧ ἐκλήθη, ἐν τούτῳ μενέτω παρὰ θεῷ *with*, *before God*, on the plane of God's judgment. That παρά with the Dat. denotes strictly direction *towards*,[1] cannot be established (Wahl in his Clav.) by Luke ix. 47, still less by Luke xix. 7 (see a) above).

e. Πρός has the same primary import as παρά, but is used in the N. T. only in its local sense: *at*, *by*, *in the* (immediate) *vicinity of;* as, Jno. xviii. 16 πρὸς τῇ θύρᾳ, xx. 11, 12; Mark v. 11 (to 414
adduce instances of the same use of πρός from Greek authors would be superfluous; for the assertion of Münter, Symbol. ad intptat. ev. Joa. p. 31, is untrue). So likewise Rev. i. 13 περιεζωσμένος πρὸς τοῖς μαστοῖς ζώνην girded about *at* the breasts with a girdle (Xen. C. 7, 1, 33). In Luke xix. 37 ἐγγίζοντος ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν is to be rendered: as he was 370
already close *to* etc. (In the Sept. πρός with the Dative occurs 7th ed.
much more frequently than in the N. T.)

f. Περί and ὑπό are never used in the N. T. with the Dative.

[1] If παρά with the Dat. is employed with a verb of motion, the same attraction must be acknowledged which occurs when ἐν is so used. But in Xen. A. 2, 5, 27, which *Kühner* adduces as the only instance, recent editors on the authority of Codd. give παρὰ Τισσαφέρνην. On the other hand, see Plutarch. Themist. c. 5 and *Sintenis* in loc. It cannot, however, be denied that in the Dative itself the notion of *whither* is originally contained (p. 214). Cf. *Hartung* über d. Casus. S. 81.

353 6th ed.

§ 49. PREPOSITIONS WITH THE ACCUSATIVE.

a. *Εἰς* (the opposite of *ἐκ* Rom. i. 17; v. 16).

a) In the *local* sense it denotes not merely *into*, *in among* (Luke x. 36; Acts iv. 17, likewise Mark xiii. 14 *εἰς τὰ ὄρη* as we say, *into the mountains*), or (of countries and cities) *to* (into) Matt. xxviii. 16; Acts x. 5; xii. 19, etc., but also (of levels) *on* Mark xi. 8 *ἔστρωσαν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν*, Acts xxvi. 14; Rev. ix. 3, and even simply *to* (ad), *thitherward* (of motion or direction) Mark iii. 7 (Polyb. 2, 23, 1), Matt. xxi. 1; Jno. xi. 38 *ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον* cometh *to* the tomb, cf. vs. 41; iv. 5 cf. vs. 28; xx. 1 cf. vs. 11; Acts ix. 2; Luke vi. 20 *ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τοὺς μαθητάς towards* his disciples, Rev. x. 5 (*εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*) Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 11; Aeschin. dial. 2, 2. In reference to persons it hardly signifies *to* (*πρός* or *ὡς* Mdv. 33; Bhdy. 215), but *among*, *inter*, Acts xx. 29; xxii. 21; Luke xi. 49; Rom. v. 12; xvi. 26; Plato Prot. 349 a.; Gorg. 526 b. (when it occasionally approaches the import of the Dative, Luke xxiv. 47, see above, § 31, 5);[1] in one passage, into a person's *house*, Acts xvi. 40 *εἰσῆλθον εἰς τὴν Λυδίαν* (according to many [minuscule] Codd.) see Valcken. in loc. cf. Lys. orat. 2 in. Strabo 17, 796; Fischer, Well. III. II. p. 150; Schoem. Isae. 363, and Plutarch. Agis p. 124, (but the better Codd. [Sin. also] give *πρός*).

415 b) Applied to *time*, *εἰς* signifies sometimes a point, limit *for*, *at* which Acts iv. 3 (Herod. 3, 5, 2), or *up to*, *till* which, Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Tim. i. 12;[2] sometimes a period (*for*, *during*, like *ἐπί*) Luke xii. 19 *εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη* (Xen. M. 3, 6, 13).

c) Used tropically, of *ideal* relations, it denotes any *aim* or *end;* as, Acts xxviii. 6 *μηδὲν ἄτοπον εἰς αὐτὸν γινόμενον* unto, towards (on) him, cf. Plut. Moral. p. 786 c.; hence, *α.* the *measure*, amount (Bhdy. 218) which something reaches, 2 Cor. x. 13 *εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχᾶσθαι*, iv. 17 (Lucian. dial. mort. 27, 7), cf. also the well-known *εἰς μάλιστα* and *εἰς τρίς*. *β.* the *condition* into which something is brought, Acts ii. 20; Rev. xi. 6; Heb. vi. 6; cf. likewise Eph. ii. 21 f. 371 7th ed. *γ.* the *result*, Rom. x. 10 (xiii. 14), 1 Cor. xi. 17 *εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον συνέρχεσθε*. *δ.* the *direction of the feelings*

[1] Likewise in 1 Cor. xiv. 36; 2 Cor. x. 14 *εἰς* is more appropriate than *πρός*, inasmuch as in all these passages ideal reaching to one (his knowledge or intercourse with him) is spoken of.

[2] (The more expressive) *ἕως* (or *μέχρι*) is oftener used in this sense; and many passages adduced in Lexicons under the signification *usque ad* are not purely temporal, but include the *εἰς* of purpose, aim, Gal. iii. 17, 23; Eph. iv. 30.

views, etc. and the deportment *towards* (erga and contra), 1 Pet. iv. 9 φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους, Rom. viii. 7 (Her. 6, 65), xii. 16; Matt. xxvi. 10; 3 Jno. 5; Col. iii. 9; 2 Cor. viii. 24; x. 1; Luke xii. 10, to which sense likewise Col. i. 20 ἀποκαταλλάττειν τι εἰς αὐτόν may be referred (cf. διαλλάττειν πρός τινα Demosth. ep. 3, 354 p. 114; Thuc. 4, 59 etc.);[1] further, the direction both of the 6th ed thoughts, Acts ii. 25 Δαυὶδ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν *aiming at* (referring *to*) *him* (dicere *in* aliquem, cf. Kypke in loc.), Eph. i. 10; v. 32; Heb. vii. 14; cf. Acts xxvi. 6,[2] and of the desires (*after* something) Phil. i. 23 and of the will in general; and then, the occasion Matt. xii. 41 εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ *at* the preaching; the purpose and end in view (Bhdy. 219) Luke v. 4 χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν *for* a draught (to catch), 2 Cor. ii. 12 ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν Τρωάδα εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον *for the gospel* i.e. in order to publish it, Acts ii. 38; vii. 5; Rom. v. 21; vi. 19; viii. 15; ix. 21; xiii. 14; xvi. 19; Heb. x. 24; xii. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 7; 2 Pet. ii. 12; 2 Cor. ii. 16; vii. 9; Gal. ii. 8; Phil. i. 25 (εἰς ὅ *for which* Col. i. 29; 2 Thess. i. 11; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 8, εἴς τι Matt. xxvi. 8). In this way are explained also the phrases ἐλπίζειν, πιστεύειν εἴς τινα, as well as the passages in which εἰς relating to persons signifies *for*, Rom. x. 12 πλουτῶν εἰς πάντας, Luke xii. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 1 etc. (and thus borders on the Dat. see a) above), and lastly, the looser connections where εἰς is rendered *in reference to*, *as respects*, *with regard to* (Bhdy. 416 220; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 484) Acts xxv. 20; 2 Pet. i. 8; Rom. iv. 20; xv. 2 (of things, Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 1; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 16), 2 Cor. xi. 10; Eph. iii. 16; iv. 15; Rom. xvi. 5 (of persons). Sometimes subjective and objective purpose, aim and effect, cannot be separated, Heb iv. 16; Luke ii. 34; Rom. xiv. 1; Jude 21. The German zu, *for*, *to*, includes both.[3] Further, cf. § 29, 3 note.

The following alleged significations of εἰς are to be rejected: *Sub* (Rom. xi. 32 cf. Gal. iii. 22); εἰς here retains the signification of *in*, as we can say included *in* just as well as *under*; *With* (of the instrument), in Acts xix. 3 εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα (ἐβαπτίσθημεν) is a direct answer to the question εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε; strictly the answer should have been, *unto that unto which John baptized*. The expression is abbreviated there-

[1] It is not necessary to consider this phrase pregnant, as *Fr.* Rom I. 278 does. It is obviously founded on the same conception as the expression preferred by Greek authors διαλλάττειν πρός τινα.

[2] Likewise ὀμόσαι εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα Matt. v. 35 is substantially to be referred to this signification; see *Fr.* in loc.

[3] But in Jno. iv. 14 ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον is probably to be rendered *into*, though *BCrusius* is of a different opinion.

fore, or rather, inexact. Nor can εἰς be strictly rendered *before, coram* in Acts xxii. 30 (see Kühnöl), cf. Heind. Plat. Protag. 471; Stallb. Plat. symp. p. 43 sq.; but ἔστησαν (αὐτὸν) εἰς αὐτούς is: introduced (placed) him *among them*, in the midst (εἰς μέσον). In 2 Cor. xi. 6 ἐν παντὶ φανερωθέντες εἰς ὑμᾶς is very nearly: *towards* you (erga), as elsewhere πρός is used. That εἰς is ever equivalent to διά with Gen. is a fiction; and εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων Acts vii. 53 is most simply rendered *upon the injunctions of angels* (which, indeed, as respects sense amounts to *in consequence of* such injunctions), unless the interpretation proposed § 32, 4 b. p. 228 be preferred. As to εἰς for ἐν see § 50, 4, p. 414 sq.

355 7th ed. b. Ἀνά *upon, up along*[1] (Bhdy. 233 f.), occurs in the N. T. chiefly in the phrase ἀνὰ μέσον with Gen. of place, *through the midst of, (in) between*, Mark vii. 31; Matt. xiii. 25, and figuratively with Gen. of a person, 1 Cor. vi. 5 διακρῖναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ. Then, with numerals, in a distributive sense; as, Jno. ii. 6 ὑδρίαι χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς *containing two or three metretae apiece*, [Matt. xx. 9], Luke ix. 3; x. 1; Mark vi. 40 (where Lchm. [and Tdf.] following Codd. B. [Sin.] give κατά); so frequently in Greek authors. The preposition thus gradually assumes the nature of an adverb (Bhdy. 234). This distributive signification probably grew out of such phrases as ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος every year, year by year.

417 Hug, in the Freiburger Zeitschr. VI. 41 f., proposed to render the above passage from John: containing *about* two or three metretae; but he has not succeeded in establishing such a use. In Polyb. 2, 10, 3 and Dio Cass. 59, 2 ἀνά manifestly signifies *each, apiece*. In Polyb. 1, 16, 2 nobody will believe that the writer intended to state the strength of the Roman legion indefinitely, as merely '*about*' 4000 foot and 300 cavalry. In Her. 7, 184 ἀνὰ διηκοσίους ἄνδρας λογιζομένοισι ἐν ἑκάστῃ νηΐ is a pleonastic expression, similar to others of frequent occurrence — 200 apiece ... in each ship, (at the rate of etc.). Rev. iv. 8 ἓν καθ' ἓν αὐτῶν ἔχον ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἓξ is similar. Moreover, the Greeks use ἐπί with the Acc. to express *about, for*, a numerical amount.

c. Διά with the Acc. indicates the *ground* (ratio), not the design (not even in 1 Cor. vii. 2),[2] and signifies *on account of* (even in

[1] *Hm.* de partic. ἄν p. 5: Primum ac proprium usum habet in iis, quae in al. rei superficie ab imo ad summum eundo conspiciuntur: motus enim significationem ei adhaerere quum ex eo intelligitur, quod non est apta visa quae cum verbo εἶναι componeretur, tum docet usus ejus adverbialis, ut ἀλλ' ἄνα ἐξ ἑδράνων. Further, cf. *Spitzner* de vi et usu praepositt. ἀνὰ et κατά. Viteb. 1831.

[2] That is to say, it is only *per consequens* that the notion of design is implied in διὰ τὰς πορνείας: *on account of fornications let every man have his own wife.* Fornications are

Jno. vii. 43; x. 19; xv. 3 etc.), or, when the motive of an action is meant, *out of, from*, Matt. xxvii. 18 διὰ φθόνον *out of* (*from*) *envy*, Eph. ii. 4 διὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἀγάπην (Diod. S. 19, 54 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἠτυχηκότας ἔλεον, Aristot. rhet. 2, 13; Demosth. Conon. 730 c.). As to Rom. iii. 25, which even Reiche has misunder- 373
stood, see Bengel. In Heb. v. 12 διὰ τὸν χρόνον is, *on account* 7th ed.
of the time, considering the time (you have enjoyed Christian instruction;[1] not, as Schulz renders it, *after* so long a time).

Sometimes διά with Acc. denotes apparently the means (ground or motive and means are very closely connected, cf. Demosth. cor. 354 a.; Xen. M. 3, 3, 15; Liv. 8, 53; and in the poets διά is sometimes used with the Acc. even in a local sense, see Bhdy. 236): Jno. vi. 57 κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα καὶ ὁ τρώγων με ζήσεται 355
δι' ἐμέ, just as in Long. pastor. 2 p. 62 Schaef. διὰ τὰς νύμφας 6th ed.
ἔζησε, Plut. Alex. 668 e. But the passage strictly means, *I live by reason of the Father*, that is, because the Father lives, cf. Plat. conv. 203 e.; Fr. Rom. I. 197, who adduces as parallel Cic. Rosc. Am. 22, 63 ut, *propter quos* hanc suavissimam lucem adspexerit, eos indignissime luce privaret. Passages more or less similar are 418
Demosth. Zenoth. 576 a.; Aristoph. Plut. 470; Aeschin. dial. 1, 2; Dion. H. III. 1579; cf. Wyttenb. Plut. Mor. II. p. 2 Lips.; Sintenis, Plutarch. Themist. 121; Thuc. ed. Poppo III. II. 517. But Heb. v. 14; vi. 7 by no means belong here, nor (as de Wette and Ewald still maintain) Rev. xii. 11 ἐνίκησαν διὰ τὸ αἷμα, cf. vii. 14 and what immediately follows, καὶ οὐκ ἠγάπησαν τὴν ψυχήν etc. As to Rom. viii. 11 (where the reading, indeed, varies) see Fr., and as to Jno. xv. 3 Mey. in loc. In 2 Cor. iv. 5; Heb. ii. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 2 (where Schott still renders it by *per*, which gives a false sense even; Bengel otherwise) Rev. iv. 11, διὰ is quite appropriately translated *for the sake of*. So too in Rom. viii. 20[2] (where Schott has *per* again). But in Rom. xv. 15 διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι

the ground of this regulation, inasmuch as they are to be prevented. In Greek authors also design sometimes in the same way attaches itself to διά; see the annotators on Thuc. 4, 40 and 102.

[1] The phrase is used thus, essentially, in Polyb. 2, 21, 2 and elsewhere, see *Bleek* on the above passage. *Schulz* insists in applying the temporal sense of διά to Heb. ii. 9 likewise. But διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου means, on account of the suffering of death, and is elucidated from the well-known connection, recognized by the apostolic writers, between the sufferings and the exaltation of Christ.

[2] Here διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα constitutes an antithesis to οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, *not voluntarily*, but *by reason of him that subjected*,—by the will and command of God. Probably Paul intentionally avoided saying διὰ τοῦ ὑποτάξαντος, equivalent to ὁ θεὸς ὑπέταξε αὐτήν. Adam's sin was the proper and direct cause of the ματαιότης.

the preposition must not, in consideration of xii. 3 *διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι*, be understood in this sense; both expressions are proper. 1 Jno. ii. 12 is correctly rendered by Lücke. 2 Pet. ii. 2 needs no comment. In 2 Pet. iii. 12 *δι' ἣν* may be referred to *ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμέρα*, and translated *on account of;* yet if referred to *παρουσία*, as is done by Bengel, it gives sense. Lastly, in Gal. iv. 13 *δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός* is probably not to be understood (Schott) of the state, condition (*δι' ἀσθενείας*), but means: *on account of* weakness, owing to a weakness; see Mey.

d. *Κατά.* The local (primary) meaning is,

a) *down upon* (down along, cf. Aeschin. dial. 3, 19), passing
374 *on, through, over* (Xen. C. 6, 2, 22); as, Luke viii. 39 *ἀπῆλθε καθ'*
7th ed. *ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων*, xv. 14 *λιμὸς κατὰ τὴν χώραν throughout the country*, all over the country, Acts viii. 1 (2 Macc. iii. 14; Strabo 3, 163); Acts v. 15 *ἐκφέρειν κατὰ τὰς πλατείας through the streets*, along the streets, viii. 36 (Xen. An. 4, 6, 11), Luke ix. 6; xiii. 22; Acts xi. 1; xxvii. 2 (Xen. C. 8, 1, 6, Raphel. in loc.).[1] Uniformly of horizontal extension. So even in Acts xxvi. 3 *τὰ*
419 *κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἔθη καὶ ζητήματα the customs* etc. *extending throughout the Jews* (common among the Jews).[2]

357 b) *on to, towards*, Phil. iii. 14 (*κατὰ σκοπόν* towards the mark),
6th ed. Acts viii. 26; xvi. 7; Luke x. 32 (Aesop. 88, 4; Xen. C. 8, 5, 17); likewise merely of the direction (geographical position, *versus*), Acts ii. 10 *τῆς Λιβύης τῆς κατὰ Κυρήνην*, xxvii. 12 *λιμένα βλέποντα κατὰ λίβα* (Xen. An. 7, 2, 1). Accordingly, *κατὰ πρόσωπόν τινος* signifies *to* one's face i.e. *before* one's eyes, Luke ii. 31; Acts iii. 13; so also *κατ' ὀφθαλμούς* Gal. iii. 1 (Xen. Hist. 1, 14 like *κατ' ὄμμα* Eurip. Androm. 1064, *κατ' ὄμματα* Soph. Ant. 756). Likewise in Rom. viii. 27 *κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνειν* does not mean (in a local sense) *apud* deum, but, properly, towards God, *before* God.[3]

[1] Κατά in its local signification is not properly synonymous with *ἐν* (as even Kühnöl on Acts xi. 1 asserts). *Κατὰ τὴν πόλιν* means, *throughout the city; καθ' ὁδόν along the road*, on the road (as on a line). Even *κατ' οἶκον*, where the primary meaning recedes farthest from view, is used to express a different conception from *ἐν οἴκῳ* (as *zu Hause, at home* is different from *im Hause, in the house*). Besides, *κατά* has established itself in many phrases where probably *ἐν* might have been used.

[2] Hence comes the meaning *with, among*, as *οἱ καθ' ὑμᾶς ποιηταί* Acts xvii. 28, cf. xiii. 1 and other passages; see above, p. 193. Κατά with a personal pronoun is employed thus, especially in later authors, as merely a circumlocution for a possessive pronoun; see *Hase*, Leo Diac. p. 230.

[3] Against this explanation, adopted also by *Fr. Krehl* and others, various objections have recently been raised, particularly by *Mey.* and *Philippi*. The most unimportant of all is that then *κατ' αὐτόν* would be used. The emphasis implied in the substantive

Closely connected with this is the *temporal* use of the preposition, sometimes as in Acts xvi. 25 *κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον towards midnight*, and sometimes as in Matt. xxvii. 15 *καθ' ἑορτήν during* the festival, i. 20 *κατ' ὄναρ during* a dream, *secundum* quietem (Herod. 2, 7, 6, *κατὰ φῶς by daylight* Xen. C. 3, 3, 25, *κατὰ βίον* Plato, Gorg. 488 a.), Heb. ix. 9 also iii. 8 (Sept.) *κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πειρασμοῦ in the day* etc., and *κατὰ τὸ αὐτό* at the same time Acts xiv. 1.

Hence it is employed of both place and time in a distributive sense, first with plural nouns, as *κατὰ φυλάς by tribes*, Matt. xxiv. 7 *κατὰ τόπους*, Acts xxii. 19, *κατὰ δύο in pairs* 1 Cor. xiv. 27 (Plato, ep. 6, 323 c.), Mark vi. 40 var.; afterwards frequently with singular nouns, as in Acts xv. 21 *κατὰ πόλιν from city to city* (Diod. S. 19, 77; Plutarch. Cleom. 25; Dio Chr. 16, 461; Palaeph. 52, 7), *κατ' ἐνιαυτόν yearly* Heb. ix. 25 (Plato, pol. 298 e.; Xen. C. 8, 6, 375
16, *κατὰ μῆνα* Xen. An. 1, 9, 17; Dio C. 750, 74), *καθ' ἡμέραν* 7th ed.
daily Acts ii. 46; 1 Cor. xvi. 2 (Hm. Vig. 860).[1]

Used *figuratively κατά* is the preposition of reference and direc- 420
tion to something: either generally, as in Eph. vi. 21 *τὰ κατ' ἐμέ* quae ad me pertinent, Acts xxv. 14, or in limitation of a general expression (Her. 1, 49; Soph. Trach. 102 and 379) Eph. vi. 5 *οἱ κατὰ σάρκα κύριοι as respects* the flesh, so far as concerns the flesh, Rom. ix. 5 *ἐξ ὧν* (*Ἰουδαίων*) *ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ κατὰ σάρκα* (1 Pet. iv. 14), Acts iii. 22; Rom. vii. 22 also xi. 28 and xvi. 25; or specially

a) the measure, the standard, *according to*, *in conformity to*, as in Eph. iv. 7; Matt. xxv. 15; Jno. ii. 6; Luke ii. 22 *κατὰ νόμον*, Heb. ix. 19 (Xen. Cyr. 5, 5, 6), Acts xxvi. 5; Rom. xi. 21 *κατὰ* 358
φύσιν, Matt. ix. 29 *κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν according to your faith*, 6.h ed.
as it deserves, 2 Cor. iv. 13; Rom. ii. 2 *κατὰ ἀλήθειαν*, Matt. ii. 16 *κατὰ χρόνον according to the time*. Hence it denotes similarity, sort (pattern), Heb. viii. 8 f. *συντελέσω . . . διαθήκην καινήν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἐποίησα* etc. (1 Kings xi. 10), Acts xviii. 14. Likewise with names of persons *κατά τινα* usually signifies according to some one's opinion Col. ii. 8 (Eph. ii. 2); 2 Cor. xi. 17, or will Rom. xv. 5; 1 Cor. xii. 8; cf. Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 91, or

is easily felt, and is indicated visibly, too, by the position of *κατὰ θεόν*, though the point of principal moment lies in *ὑπὲρ ἁγίων*. The translation, *according to God*, introduces an entirely unnecessary idea into the passage, since of the Spirit no different intercession can be thought of.

[1] Also *καθ' ἑαυτόν for one's self* is usually referred to this use (see e.g. *Passow*), but erroneously, as the phrase is not distributive. *Καθ' ἑαυτόν*, and the like, properly means *in reference to one's self*, whereby something is restricted to a single subject; hence *for one's self*, adv. seorsum. As to *ἔχειν κ. ἑαυτόν*, see *Fr.* Rom. III. 212.

according to some one's pattern and example, as in Gal. iv. 28 κατὰ Ἰσαάκ in the same way as Isaac, ad exemplum Isaaci, 1 Pet. i. 15; Eph. iv. 24 (Plato, Parm. 126 c.; Lucian. pisc. 6, 12; eunuch. 13; Dio C. 376, 59; cf. Kypke and Wetst. on Gal. as above, Marle, floril. p. 64 sq.). It is used of authors: τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον the gospel (the evangelic history) as recorded by Matthew (according to Matthew's understanding and exposition of it). As to εἶναι κατὰ σάρκα, κατὰ πνεῦμα Rom. viii. 5, see the expositors. In the (Pauline) phrase κατ' ἄνθρωπον *after the manner of man*, in (ordinary) human fashion, (with contexts of various descriptions), κατά is used more generally: Rom. iii. 5; Gal. i. 11; iii. 15; 1 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 6 (see Wiesing. in loc.), see Fr. Rom. I. 159 sq.[1] Cf. in connection with the same use of κατά,
421 Rom. iv. 4 κατὰ χάριν by way of grace, 1 Cor. ii. 1 καθ' ὑπεροχὴν
376 λόγου, Phil. iii. 6; Eph. vi. 6; Rom. xiv. 15; Acts xxv. 23 ἀνδράσι
7th ed. τοῖς κατ' ἐξοχὴν τῆς πόλεως.

b) the occasion (and the motive), a sense closely allied to the preceding (hence in Rom. iv. 4 κατὰ χάριν may be rendered also, *of* (*out of*) *grace*), Matt. xix. 3 ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν *for* every cause, *on* every ground (Kypke in loc., cf. Paus. 5, 10, 2; 6, 18; 2, 7), Rom. ii. 5; Acts iii. 17 κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε in consequence of ignorance (Raphel. in loc.), Phil. iv. 11 οὐχ ὅτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω from (in consequence of suffering) want, Tit. iii. 5; 1 Pet. i. 3 κατὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος,[2] Eph. i. 5; Her. 9, 17 (κατὰ τὸ ἔχθος) etc. cf. Diog. L. 6, 10; Arrian. Al. 1, 17, 13. Also in Heb. xi. 7 ἡ κατὰ πίστιν δικαιοσύνη the righteousness which proceeds from faith.

c) the intention, purpose, *for*, *to* (Jno. ii. 6), 2 Tim. i. 1;[3] Tit. i. 1 (cf. Rom. i. 5 εἰς), and the (necessary) result, 2 Cor. xi. 21

[1] In 2 Cor. vii. 9, 10 λυπεῖσθαι κατὰ θεόν and λύπη κ. θ. is not sorrow produced by God (*Kypke* in loc.), but, as *Bengel* aptly says, animi Deum spectantis et sequentis, to sorrow *according to God* i.e. after the mind and will of God. In the passage that follows Paul might in the same way have written ἡ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον λύπη. But ἡ τοῦ κόσμου λύπη has a meaning somewhat different: *the sorrow of the world*, i.e. as the world (those who belong to the world) possesses and experiences it (of course about the things of the κόσμος). *Bengel* in like manner has duly appreciated the difference between these two expressions. In 1 Pet. iv. 6 κατὰ ἀνθρώπους means after the manner of men, and is more closely defined by the annexed σαρκί; just so κατὰ θεόν means after the manner of God, which is more closely defined by πνεύματι (for God is πνεῦμα).

[2] Accordingly κατά sometimes stands parallel to the Dat. (instrum.), as in Arrian. Al. 5, 21, 4 κατ' ἔχθος τὸ Πώρου μᾶλλον ἢ φιλίᾳ τῇ Ἀλεξάνδρου. See *Fr.* Rom. I. 99.

[3] *Matthies* gives an artificial exposition with the remark that it cannot be shown that κατά expresses *object*. This import, however, is very naturally involved in the original meaning of this preposition. Moreover, see *Mtth.* 1356, 1359.

κατ᾽ ἀτιμίαν λέγω *to* (as a, by way of) *reproach* (Her. 2, 152; Thuc. 5, 7; 6, 31). The signification *cum* must be rejected, though κατά may sometimes be translated *with*. In Rom x. 2 359
ζῆλος θεοῦ ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατ᾽ ἐπίγνωσιν is *zeal for God, but not according* 6th ed.
to knowledge, i.e. not as zeal resulting from knowledge manifests itself (cf. above, κατ᾽ ἄγνοιαν), 1 Pet. iii. 7. In Heb. xi. 13 κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον etc. means: they died in (*according to*) faith, without having received etc.; it was in accordance with faith (with the nature of πίστις) that they died having seen only from afar the fulfilment of the promises. The idea of κατὰ πίστιν is contained in the second participial clause.

c. Ὑπέρ with Acc. signifies *beyond*, *away-over* (Her. 4, 188; Plato, Crit. 108 e.; Plut. virt. mul. p. 231 Lips.). In the N. T. it never occurs in reference to place, but is always used figuratively, *beyond*, *over and above* in number, rank, quality; as, Acts xxvi. 13 φῶς περιλάμψαν . . . ὑπὲρ τὴν λαμπρότητα τοῦ ἡλίου, Matt. x. 24 οὐκ ἔστι μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον, Philem. 16; Matt. x. 37 ὁ φιλῶν πατέρα ὑπὲρ ἐμέ (Aesch. dial. 3, 6), 2 Cor. i. 8 (Epict. 31, 37); Gal. i. 14, also 2 Cor. xii. 13 τί γάρ ἐστιν, ὃ ἡττήθητε ὑπὲρ τὰς λοιπὰς ἐκκλησίας *inferior beyond the other churches* (gradation 422
downwards). Concerning ὑπέρ after comparatives, see § 35, 1.

f. Μετά denotes motion *into the midst of* something, Iliad 2, 376. Then it signifies motion *after*, *behind*, something; in prose, however, it more frequently means *behind*, *after* (post) of a state of rest, Heb. ix. 3 μετὰ τὸ δεύτερον καταπέτασμα (Paus. 3, 1, 1). In all other passages of the N. T. where it occurs it signifies *after* in regard to time, (the opposite of πρό), even in Matt. xxvii. 63 — where the popular expression presents no difficulty, see Krebs, obs. p. 87 sq. — and 1 Cor. xi. 25 μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, which must 377
not, in consideration of Matt. xxvi. 26 (ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν), be 7th ed.
rendered by *during*; on the other hand, cf. Luke xxii. 20. So too, the familiar expression μεθ᾽ ἡμέραν *interdiu* (Ellendt, Arrian. Al. 4, 13, 10) properly denotes *post lucem*, after daybreak.

g. Παρά. The primary import is *beside*, *along*, of a line or extended space, Matt. iv. 18 περιπατῶν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν . . . εἶδε etc. *walking along the sea-side* (Xen. C. 5, 4, 41; A. 4, 6, 4; 6, 2, 1; Plato Gorg. 511 e.), xiii. 4 ἔπεσε παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν *fell* (along) *by the wayside*. Then it is used also of a point of space, — belonging, however, to an extended object; as, ἔρχεσθαι παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν *to the sea-side* Matt. xv. 29; Acts xvi. 13, ῥίπτειν or τιθέναι παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τ. to beside the feet Matt. xv. 30; Acts

iv. 35 ; cf. Held, Plutarch. Timol. 356. It is used only thus also with verbs of rest,[1] as of *sitting*, *standing*, *lying*, (*being situated*) παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν or τὴν λίμνην or παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν (*propter* mare, viam) Matt. xx. 30 ; Luke v. 1 sq. ; xviii. 35 ; Heb. xi. 11 ; Acts x. 6 ᾧ ἐστιν οἰκία παρὰ θάλασσαν (vs. 32), cf. Xen. A. 3, 5, 1 ; 7, 2, 11 ; Paus. 1, 38, 9 ; Aesop. 44, 1 ; Hartung d. Casus S. 83.

360 Further, παρά means *beside* the mark or aim, and consequently
6th ed. (as the context may determine), sometimes *above*, as in Rom. xii. 3 (to which Fr. compares Plutarch. Mor. 83 f. θαυμασταὶ παρ' ὃ δεῖ), sometimes *below*, as in 2 Cor. xi. 24 πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν *forty* (with the omission of one) *less one*, Joseph. antt. 4, 8, 1 (cf. Heb. ii. 7 Sept.), Bhdy. 258. In the former sense it is used figuratively,

a) in comparisons, as in Luke xiii. 2 ἁμαρτωλοὶ παρὰ πάντας
423 *above all* (*more than* all, see ὑπέρ, cf. § 35, 2 b.), iii. 13 ; Heb. i. 9 (Sept.) ; iii. 3 (Dio Cass. 152, 16 ; analogous to which is ἄλλος παρά 1 Cor. iii. 11 *other than*, equivalent to the ordinary ἄλλος ἤ, cf. Stallb. Phileb. 51) ; Rom. xiv. 5 κρίνειν ἡμέραν παρ' ἡμέραν *to judge* (esteem) *one day above another*, i.e. to prefer one day to another.

b) *against:* Acts xviii. 13 παρὰ νόμον (Xen. M. 1, 1, 18; Lucian. Demon. 49) ; Rom. i. 26 παρὰ φύσιν (*praeter* naturam Plat. rep. 5, 466 d. ; Plut. educ. 4, 9) ; iv. 18 παρ' ἐλπίδα (*praeter* spem, Plato pol. 295 d.) ; xvi. 17 ; Heb. xi. 11 (Thuc. 3, 54 ; Xen. A. 2, 5, 41 ; 5, 8, 17 ; 6, 4, 28 ; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 38) ; compare the expressions *overstep*, *transgress*, the law. The opposite would be: κατὰ φύσιν etc., cf. Xen. M. as above, Plut. educ. 4, 9.

c) in Rom. i. 25 παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα *with the omission of the Creator* (consequently, instead of the Creator). In one passage παρά indicates the ground or reason : 1 Cor. xii. 15 [16] παρὰ τοῦτο *therefore*, strictly with (beside) this, since this is so, Weber, Demosth. p. 521 (Plut. Camill. 28 ; Dio C. 171, 96 ; Lucian. paras.
378 12 and often). In Latin, as is well-known, *propter* (from prope,
7th ed. cf. propter flumen) became the ordinary causal preposition, (Vig. p. 862 ; Vkm. Fritzsche, quaestion. Lucian. p. 124 sq. ; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 182).

h. Πρός *to*, *towards*, with verbs of motion or mere direction (Acts iv. 24 ; Eph. iii. 14 ; 1 Cor. xiii. 12 πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον

[1] Such expressions as Polyb. 1, 55, 7 ἐν τῇ παρὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν κειμένῃ πλευρᾷ τῆς Σικελίας situated (extending) towards, alongside of, Italy, constitute the transition to this use of the preposition.

face turned to face). Sometimes the force of the Acc. seems to disappear and πρός means *with*, particularly before names of persons, as in Matt. xiii. 56; Jno. i. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 6 (Demosth. Apat. 579 a.); even here, however, πρός denotes (ideal) annexation. But the appropriateness of the Acc. is still perceptible in Mark iv. 1 ὁ ὄχλος πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἦν on the land *towards the sea* (by the sea-side), ii. 2; still more in Acts v. 10; xiii. 31; Phil. iv. 6; see Fr. Mr. p. 201 sq., cf. Schoem. Isac. p. 244. The Latin *ad*, as is well-known, has both significations.

The *temporal* applications πρὸς καιρόν *for a time* Luke viii. 13; Jno. v. 35; Heb. xii. 10 ℣, and πρὸς ἑσπέραν *towards evening* Luke xxiv. 29 (Wetst. I. 826), are seen at a glance to be warranted; (cf. above, ἐπί § 47, g, d) p. 375, and § 48, c. p. 392).

Figuratively, πρός denotes the end towards which something is directed, and consequently the result, issue, as 2 Pet. iii. 16 ἃ ... στρεβλοῦσιν ... πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, Heb. v. 14; ix. 13; 1 Tim. iv. 7 (Simplic. in Epict. 13 p. 146), Jno. xi. 4; but especially the direction of the mind towards something, e.g. Heb. i. 7 424
πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει *in reference to* (speaking with regard to them), Luke xx. 19; Rom. x. 21 (not Heb. xi. 18), like dicere *in* aliquem; cf. Plutarch. de εἰ ap. Delph. c. 21; Xen. M. 4, 2, 15;—in particular

a) disposition *towards* one, *erga* and *contra*,[1] as in Luke xxiii. 12; 361
1 Thess. v. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 2; vii. 12; Acts vi. 1; Heb. xii. 4; Col. 6th ed.
iv. 5; Rev. xiii. 6.

b) design (direction of the will) and object (purpose, behalf), as in 1 Cor. x. 11; xii. 7; Matt. vi. 1; Heb. vi. 11; Acts xxvii. 12; 2 Cor. xi. 8; 1 Pet. iv. 12. Hence πρὸς τί *wherefore* (quo consilio) Jno. xiii. 28; cf. Soph. Aj. 40.

c) consideration *for* something, Matt. xix. 8 Μωσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν ἐπέτρεψεν etc. out of regard to, *on account of*, the hardness of your hearts (Polyb. 5, 27, 4; 38, 3, 10).

d) the rule *after*, *according to*, which one is guided, Luke xii. 47; Gal. ii. 14; 2 Cor. v. 10; Lucian. conscr. hist. 38; Plat. apol. 40 e.; Aeschin. dial. 3, 17; and hence the standard *according to* which a comparison is instituted, as in Rom. viii. 18 οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι compared *to*, as if applied *to* a standard of comparison, Bar. iii. 36 (Thuc.

[1] Thus used but seldom except in verbs already containing the notion of hostility, as in Sext. Empir. 3, 2 (Dio C. 250, 92). This remark is necessary to qualify the statement in my Observatt. in. epist. Jac. p. 16.

6, 31; Plat. Gorg. 471 e.; Hipp. maj. 281 d.; Isocr. big. p. 842; Aristot. pol. 2, 9, 1; Demosth. ep. 4, 119 a; cf. Wolf, Leptin. p. 251; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 340).

379 7th ed. That in such expressions as διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην πρός τινα, διακρίνεσθαι πρός τινα, εἰρήνην ἔχειν πρός τινα (Rom. v. 1), κοινωνία πρός τι 2 Cor. vi. 14 (cf. Philo ad Caium 1007; Himer. eclog. 18, 3) etc. (see Alberti, observ. p. 303; Fr. Rom. I. 252) the preposition drops the meaning *cum*,[1] and signifies simply *towards*, has already been acknowledged by Bretschn. and Wahl. Also in Heb. iv. 13 πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, the preposition denotes direction; and Kühnöl might have reserved his remark, 'πρός signifies *cum*' (cf. Elsner in loc.). Schleusner's rendering of the phrase εὔχεσθαι πρὸς θεόν by *precari a deo*, deserves to be mentioned only as a striking instance of unlimited empiricism.

i. Περί *about, around.* Primarily of place, as in Acts xxii. 6 περιαστράψαι φῶς περὶ ἐμέ *a light shone round about me*, Luke 425 xiii. 8; also with verbs of rest, as in Mark iii. 34 οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν καθήμενοι, Matt. iii. 4 εἶχε ζώνην περὶ τὴν ὀσφύν *about his loins.* Then of time, as in Mark vi. 48 περὶ τετάρτην φυλακήν *about* the fourth watch (*circa* in Latin), Matt. xx. 3 (Aeschin. ep. 1, 121 b.); Acts xxii. 6. Lastly, of the object around which an action or a state revolves, as it were, as in Acts xix. 25 οἱ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐργάται (Xen. Vectig. 4, 28); Luke x. 40 (Lucian. indoct. 6); 1 Tim. vi. 4 νοσῶν περὶ ζητήσεις (Plat. Phaed. 228 e.). Hence it is sometimes equivalent to *in reference to*, as in Tit. ii. 7; 1 Tim. i. 19; 2 Tim. iii. 8 (Xen. Mem. 4, 3, 2; Isocr. Evag. 4; errorem *circa* literas habuit, and similar expressions, occur in Quintil. and Sueton.). Cf. above, § 30, 3, note 5 p. 192, and Ast, Plat. legg. p. 37; but especially Glossar. Theodoret. p. 317 sqq. Worthy of notice, further, is the phrase οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον *Paul and his companions* 362 8th ed. Acts xiii. 13,[2] like οἱ περὶ Ξενοφῶντα Xen. An. 7, 4, 16, οἱ περὶ Κέκροπα Xen. Mem. 3, 5, 10, an expression which in later authors denotes the leader alone, Hm. Vig. 700. So probably in Jno. xi. 19

[1] Μετά in such phrases is used also by Greek authors, though this use seems to become more common in the later language, Malal. 2, 52 ἐπολέμησαν μετ' ἀλλήλων, 13 p. 317, 337; 18 p. 457.

[2] Greek writers, as is well known, employ ἀμφί likewise in this circumlocution; but in simple prose περί is in general far more frequent. That the expression οἱ περὶ τὸν Παῦλον means not only the 'surroundings' (followers, companions, etc.) of Paul, but also includes Paul himself, arises probably from the pictorial nature of the preposition, which denotes *what encompasses*, and thus Paul's company. An expression somewhat analogous to this is used in German, e.g. Müllers (genit.) i.e. Müller and his household. (In Franconia they say, die Müllerschen, *the Müllers*, also including the head of the family.)

αἱ περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίαν is to be interpreted; for the *αὐτὰς* following can only refer to the two sisters. Examples (but without precise discrimination) are adduced also by Wetst. I. 915 sq.; Schwarz, Comment. p. 1074; Schweigh. Lexic. Polyb. p. 463. See also Bhdy. 263.

k. *Ὑπό* originally denotes local motion, *underneath*, Matt. viii. 8 *ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς*, Luke xiii. 34 *ἐπισυνάξαι τὴν νοσσιὰν* 380
ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας (Xen. C. 5, 4, 43; Plutarch. Thes. 3); also rest, 7th ed
i.e. the being (extending) *under* a surface, as in Acts ii. 5 *οἱ ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανόν*, Luke xvii. 24 (Plat. ep. 7, 326 c.), 1 Cor. x. 1 (Her. 2, 127; Plut. Themist. 26; Aesop. 36, 3),[1] also in Rom. iii. 13 (Sept.) *ἰὸς ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χείλη αὐτῶν under* their lips (cf. Her. 1, 12 *κατακρύπτειν ὑπὸ τὴν θύρην*). Then figuratively (Bhdy. 267; Boissonade, Nic. p. 56), Rom. vii. 14 *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν sold under sin*, into the power of sin, Matt. viii. 9 *ἔχων ὑπ' ἐμαυτὸν στρατιώτας* (Xen. C. 8, 8, 5) under me i.e. subject to my power, 1 Pet. v. 6; often in the phrase *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι ὑπό τι* to be under, 426
given up to, something, Matt. viii. 9; Rom. iii. 9; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Gal. iii. 10; iv. 2, 21 (Lucian. abdic. 23). It is applied to time in Acts v. 21 *ὑπὸ τὸν ὄρθρον* (Lucian. amor. 1) *close upon, towards* (like the local expression *ὑπὸ τὸ τεῖχος*). Similar instances are of frequent occurrence in Greek authors; as, *ὑπὸ νύκτα*, *ὑπὸ τὴν ἕω* etc. (see Alberti, observ. p. 224; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 146; Schweigh. Lexic. Polyb. p. 633). The Romans, too, use *sub* in the same way.

l. *Ἐπί* 1) Of place: motion *upon* (*over* a level surface) Matt. xxvii. 45 *σκότος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν*, xiv. 19 *ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοὺς χόρτους*, Acts vii. 11 (xvii. 26); *on* or *to*, coming from above or below, accordingly *down upon* Matt. x. 29 *ἐπὶ γῆν*, Acts iv. 33, *up upon* Acts x. 9 *ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα*, Matt. xxiv. 16; 1 Pet. ii. 24 (Xen. C. 3, 1, 4), also *on* (*upon*) Jno. xiii. 25 *ἐπιπίπτειν ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος on* the breast (Jno. xxi. 20); *up before* (a high court) Matt. x. 18; Luke xii. 11; in general, of the end *towards*, *after*, *at* (which one advances, strives, arrives, etc.) Luke xv. 4; xxii. 52; Acts viii. 36; Phil. iii. 14 (var.) Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 39; An. 6, 2, 2; Kypke in loc., rarely merely *to* (of persons) Mark v. 21; Acts i. 21.[2] 368
From this primary import we may easily explain the application 6th ed

[1] Accordingly Eurip. Alcest. 907 *λῦπαί τε φίλων τῶν ὑπὸ γαῖαν*, which Monk changed into *ὑπὸ γαίας*, may probably be tolerated. Cf. *Matthiae*, Eurip. Hec. 144. The phrase is certainly not peculiar to later Greek (Palaeph. 10, 1).

[2] From such passages must be distinguished Luke x. 9 *ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*. Here a heavenly gift is spoken of which comes *down* on men; cf. Acts i. 8.

of the preposition in Acts x. 10 ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔκστασις (v. 5), i. 26 ἔπεσεν ὁ κλῆρος ἐπὶ Ματθίαν, v. 28 ἐπαγαγεῖν ἐπί τινα τὸ αἷμα ἀνθρώπου τινός, Jno. i. 33 and elsewhere. The German *auf*, almost universally applicable as it is, is very similar (only, in rendering Matt. xxvii. 29 ἐπέθηκαν κάλαμον ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν, a German would say, *in die rechte Hand;* better Codd., however, [Sin. also] give ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ, and the common reading cannot be defended by Rev. xx. 1). It is only in appearance that ἐπί with the Acc. is joined to verbs of rest; as in Matt. xiii. 2 ὁ ὄχλος ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλὸν εἱστήκει *stood* (had placed themselves) *upon the shore*, cf. Odyss. 11, 577; Diod. S. 20, 7. In Matt. xix. 28 καθίσεσθε ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους (Paus. 1, 35, 2), 2 Cor. iii. 15 κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν κεῖται, Acts x. 17;
381 xi. 11, the same remark applies to the use of ἐπί as to that of
7th ed. εἰς in similar circumstances; see § 50, 4 b.; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. II. 91.[1]

427 2) Of the time *over* which something extends; as, Luke iv. 25 ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία *for, during*, three years, Acts xiii. 31; xix. 10; Heb. xi. 30; cf. Her. 3, 59; 6, 101; Thuc. 2, 25; Xen. C. 6, 2, 34; Plat. legg. 12, 945 b.; Strabo 9, 401. Hence ἐφ' ὅσον Matt. ix. 15; 2 Pet. i. 13 (Polyaen. 6, 22) *as long as*. More rarely of the point of time *towards* which, *at* which, something takes place, Acts iii. 1 see Alberti in loc.

3) Figuratively: a) of the number and degree to which something amounts, as in Rev. xxi. 16 ἐπὶ σταδίους δώδεκα χιλιάδων — where we use *up to* (Her. 4, 198; Xen. C. 7, 5, 8; Polyb. 4, 39, 4) Rom. xi. 13 ἐφ' ὅσον *in quantum* i.e. quatenus. b) of superin-

[1] Jas. v. 14 προσευξάσθωσαν ἐπ' αὐτόν may mean *let them pray over* (upon) *him* (folding their hands over him in prayer, cf. Acts xix. 13), or *pray down upon him*, or even *over him*, for ἐπί is very often used with Acc. where the Dat. or Gen. might have been expected. A recent expositor should not have rejected this exposition so lightly. In Luke v. 25 ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο (as the best Codd. [Sin. also] read) may be explained either according to the preceding remark, or thus: *upon* (over) *which* (a level) *he lay*. Moreover what is said above seems sufficient to justify the reading, furnished by good authority [also by Cod. Sin.] and already adopted by *Lchm.*, in Jno. xxi 4 ἔστη ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν (cf. Xen. Cyr. 3, 3, 68, see above in the text), which *Matthäi* erroneously calls a *semigraecam correctionem*. Elsewhere certainly the difference between ἐπί with Acc. and ἐπί with Gen. or Dat. is sometimes inconsiderable. When it is supposed, however, that in Mark xv. 24 (we also say *über die* Kleidung loosen) Phil. ii. 27 (sorrow *upon* sorrow — so that one sorrow comes upon another already present) the Acc. stands *for* the Gen. or Dat., a closer examination of the passages shows at once the incorrectness of the supposition. But in Luke xxiii. 28; Rev. xviii. 11 the Dat. also might certainly have been employed, cf. Luke xix. 41; Rev. xviii. 20, and in Rev. v. 1 the Acc. would have been even more correct. These two constructions, though, are based on somewhat different views of the matter. We also say *über eine Sache* freuen (to rejoice *over* a thing).

tendence and power *over*, Rev. xiii. 7 ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ἐπὶ πᾶσαν φυλήν, Heb. iii. 6; x. 21 (Xen. C. 4, 5, 58), cf. Luke ii. 8; xii. 14, βασιλεύειν ἐπί τινα Luke i. 33; Rom. v. 14; cf. Malal. 5 p. 143. c) of the heart's direction, the disposition, hence *towards* (Franke, Dem. 127), *erga* and *contra*, Matt. x. 21; Luke vi. 35; 2 Cor. x. 2; 364
Rom. ix. 23 (not 1 Pet. iii. 12), Sturz, ind. to Dio C. p. 151; hence 6th ed.
to trust, hope, *upon* Matt. xxvii. 43; 2 Cor. ii. 3; 1 Tim. v. 5; 1 Pet. i. 13, but also σπλαγχνίζεσθαι ἐπί τινι, to have compassion *on* (towards) one, Matt. xv. 32; Mark viii. 2. d) of the direction of thought or discourse, Mark ix. 12; Heb. vii. 13 (Rom. iv. 9), or the will, and consequently of the intention and aim, Luke xxiii. 48 (Plat. Crit. 52 b.), Matt. iii. 7 (Xen. M. 2, 3, 13; Cyr. 7, 2, 14; Fischer, ind. ad Palaeph. under ἐπί), Matt. xxvi. 50 ἐφ' ὅ (Plato, Gorg. 447 b.), also when aim and result coincide, Heb. xii. 10. Lastly, it is used in a very general sense: *in reference to*, as Matt. xxv. 40, 45 (as to Rom. xi. 13 see a)). On 428
πιστὸς ἐπί τι Matt. xxv. 21, see Fr. in loc.

§ 50. INTERCHANGE, ACCUMULATION, AND REPETITION OF PREPOSITIONS. 382 7th ed.

1. The same preposition is employed in the same sentence or in parallel passages (especially of the first three Evangelists) with different cases to denote different relations; as, Heb. ii. 10 δι' ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, Rev. v. 1; xi. 10; xiv. 6; cf. 1 Cor. xi. 9, 12 οὐκ ἀνὴρ διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα,—ἀνὴρ διὰ τῆς γυναικός. Cf. Demosth. Philipp. 2 p. 25 c. To this more remotely may be referred Heb. xi. 29 διέβησαν τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν ὡς διὰ ξηρᾶς, where the Acc. is governed by the compound διαβαίνειν, after which, however, διά itself governs the Genitive (cf. Josh. xxiv. 17 οὓς παρήλθομεν δι' αὐτῶν, Wisd. x. 18). The distinction between such different cases, in itself delicate, sometimes almost wholly disappears in practice; as, Matt. xix. 28 ὅταν καθίσῃ ... ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθίσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, xxiv. 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, Mark xiii. 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ (cf. Josh. v. 15 in one and the same clause ἐφ' ᾧ νῦν ἕστηκας ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, Gen. xxxix. 5; xlix. 26; Exod. viii. 3; xii. 7; Jon. iv. 10), Rev. v. 1, 13; vi. 2, 16; vii. 1; xiii. 16. In the same way Greek authors employ ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἵππους and ἐπὶ τῶν ἵππων (Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 272) the one as often

as the other (Sept. even *ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ ταῖς οἰκίαις* Joel. ii. 9). In Rev. xiv. 9 we find *λαμβάνει τὸ χάραγμα ἐπὶ τοῦ μετώπου αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ*, xiii. 1. Cf. also Diog. L. 2, 77 . . . *ἐπὶ τί ἥκου; ἔφη ἐπὶ τῷ μεταδώσειν* etc., Pol. 6, 7, 2 *τραφέντας ὑπὸ τοιούτοις*, but 10, 25, 1 *τραφεὶς καὶ παιδευθεὶς ὑπὸ Κλεάνδρου*. In general, see Jacobs, Anthol. III. 194, 286; Bhdy. 200 f. Such apparent indifference as respects case occurs most frequently with *ἐπί* (Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 74), cf. *ἐλπίζειν ἐπί τινι* and *τινα* 1 Tim. iv. 10; v. 5, *πεποιθέναι ἐπί τινι* and *τινα* 2 Cor. i. 9; ii. 3, *καταστῆσαι ἐπί τινος* and *τινι* Luke xii. 42, 44 (*κόπτεσθαι ἐπί τινα* Rev. i. 7 and *ἐπί τινι* xviii. 9 var.), *ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ κοιτῶνος* Acts xii. 20 and *ὁ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἄρκυσι* Xen. Cyr. 2, 4, 25; see Lob. Phryn. 474 sq.
429 Moreover, see as to *ἐπί* used of aim with Gen. Bremi, Aesch. p. 412, with Dat. and Acc. Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 59, as to *ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ* and *ἐφ' ἑαυτῷ* Schoem. Isae. p. 349, as to *παρά* with Gen. instead of
365 Dat. Schaef. Dion. p. 118 sq. Hence in detached instances, where
6th ed. an exact parallel may not be found in Greek authors (Luke i. 59 *καλεῖν ἐπί τινι* cf. Ezra ii. 61; Neh. vii. 63 etc.), we are not authorized to pronounce the construction un-Greek, particularly if something analogous can be adduced (Mtth. 1374), or if the case employed can be easily conceived as connected with the preposition in question. On the other hand, the N. T. writers never use *ἐπὶ Κλαυδίῳ* or *Κλαύδιον* for *ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου*, nor construe *ἐπί* of condition (stipulation) with the Gen. or Acc. It was not till a later period that different cases, which though construed with the
383 same preposition conveyed different significations, began to be
7th ed. confounded in the written language of the Greeks, so that e.g. *μετά* with Gen. and *μετά* with Acc. came to be used in the same sense, see above, p. 363.

That in the same sentence the same preposition with the same case should be used in *different* relations and senses cannot be considered any more strange in Greek than in any other language, e.g. Luke xi. 50 *ἵνα ἐκζητηθῇ τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν . . . ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἄβελ* etc., Rom. xv. 13 *εἰς τὸ περισσεύειν ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος ἁγίου*, Jno. ii. 23 *ἦν ἐν τ. Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ*, 2 Cor. vii. 16 *χαίρω ὅτι ἐν παντὶ θαῤῥῶ ἐν ὑμῖν*, xii. 12; 1 Cor. iii. 18; Rom. i. 9; Eph. i. 3, 14; ii. 3, 7; iv. 22; vi. 18; Phil. i. 26; ii. 16; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4; Col. i. 29; ii. 2; iv. 2; Heb. v. 3; ix. 11 f.; Jno. iv. 45 (xvii. 15); Acts xvii. 31; 2 Pet. i. 4 (Philostr. her. 4, 1; Arrian. Epict. 4, 13, 1).

2. The two different prepositions in the same sentence in Philem.

5 ἀκούων σου τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους are usually explained by referring, in regard to the sense, the words πρὸς τὸν κύριον to πίστιν, and εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους to ἀγάπην; — a *chiasmus* in which there would be nothing inherently surprising, cf. Plat. legg. 9, 868 b. (see Ast, animadv. p. 16), Horat. Serm. 1, 3, 51 and the expositors in loc. It is simpler, however, to take πίστις in the sense of *fidelity*, and to let both πρὸς τ. κ. and εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους depend upon it alike, without making any distinction between the prepositions; see Meyer. Though some Codd. give εἰς in the former 430
clause, this is only a correction, occasioned by the endeavor to make the phraseology uniform and by the circumstance that elsewhere faith in Christ is always called πίστις ἡ εἰς Χριστόν. Yet the expression πίστιν ἔχειν πρός τινα is quite unobjectionable, and occurs at least in Epiphan. Opp. II. 335 d. As to Luke v. 15; Jno. vii. 42; 2 Cor. x. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 3; Rom. iv. 18; x. 17; Eph. iv. 12; 1 Jno. iii. 24; 1 Thess. iv. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 12, no remark is required. On 1 Cor. iv. 10; 2 Cor. iv. 17; iii. 5; xiii. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 8 see the more recent expositors. On the other hand, in 1 Thess. ii. 6 οὔτε ζητοῦντες ἐξ ἀνθρώπων δόξαν, οὔτε ἀφ' ὑμῶν οὔτε ἀπ' ἄλλων the two prepositions are quite synonymous, as also in Jno. xi. 1; Acts xxiii. 34. In Rom. iii. 30 Paul certainly does not have in view any difference of meaning (between ἐκ πίστεως and διὰ τῆς πίστεως), as doctrinally considered πίστις may with equal propriety be conceived of either as the source or as the means of blessedness (Gal. iii. 8; Eph. ii. 8). Cf. from Greek authors Paus. 7, 7, 1 αἱ ἐκ πολέμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς νόσου συμφοραί, Isocr. permut. 738; Arrian. Al. 2, 18, 9; Diod. S. 5, 30; Schaef. Gnom. p. 203 366
and Soph. I. 248; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 45. As little difference 6th ed.
is there between the two prepositions in 2 Jno. 2 τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται, and in Exod. vi. 4 ἐν ᾗ (γῇ) καὶ παρῴκησαν ἐπ' αὐτῆς, Jon. iv. 10. Lastly, in 2 Cor. iii. 11 the distinction urged by Billroth between διὰ δόξης and ἐν δόξῃ will 384
hardly stand the test of usage, see above, p. 386. As to διά of 7th ed.
condition (state), see p. 379 sq. On the other hand, the difference of import between κατά and ἐπί in 1 Cor. xi. 4, 10 and between ἐκ and διά in 1 Pet. i. 23 is manifest.

3. Prepositions of kindred signification are substituted for each other in parallel passages in the Gospels and elsewhere; as, Matt. xxvi. 28 (Mark xiv. 24) αἷμα τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον, on the contrary, Luke xxii. 20 τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλ. ἐκχ.; Matt. vii. 16 μήτι

συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλήν, on the contrary, Luke vi. 44 *οὐκ ἐξ ἀκανθ. συλλέγουσι σῦκα*; Matt. xxiv. 16 *φευγέτωσαν ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη* (*up to*) cf. Palaeph. 1, 10, but Mark xiii. 14 *φευγ. εἰς τὰ ὄρη* (*into*); Jno. x. 32 *διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον λιθάζετέ με;* vs. 33 *περὶ καλοῦ ἔργου οὐ λιθάζομέν σε*; Heb. vii. 2 *ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισεν Ἀβραάμ*, vs. 4 *ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβρ. ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων*; Rom. iii. 25 *εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ*, on the contrary, vs. 26 *πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν τ. δικ. αὐτοῦ*. Cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 43 *πρὸς*
431 *αὐτὸ τὸ τεῖχος προσήγαγον . . . οὐκ ἐθέλω ὑπ' αὐτὰ τὰ τείχη ἄγειν*. Here belongs also Heb. xi. 2 *ἐν ταύτῃ* (*τῇ πίστει*) *ἐμαρτυρήθησαν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*, vs. 39 *πάντες μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως* (through faith, i.e. ut instructi fide); here the phrases *εὔχεσθαι, προσεύχεσθαι, εὐχαριστεῖν, δέησις περί* or *ὑπέρ τινος* (Rom. x. 1; 2 Cor. i. 11; Eph. vi. 18; Col. i. 3, 9; 1 Cor. i. 4; Eph. i. 16; cf. Acta apocr. p. 53); here too the expression *suffer* or *die περὶ* or *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν* (the former signifying *on account of*, the latter *for*, sins) 1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 18. Sometimes even the good Codd. vary between *ὑπέρ* and *περί*, as in Gal. i. 4, as these prepositions were often interchanged by the transcribers. Cf. Weber, Dem. 129. (Recent editors have proposed, assuredly without sufficient reason, to correct the reading in Eurip. Alcest. 180, where *οὐ θνήσκειν πέρι* occurs instead of the elsewhere more usual *ὑπέρ*, see Monk in loc.)

Sometimes we find in parallel phrases a preposition now inserted and now omitted; as, 1 Pet. iv. 1 *παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί*, and immediately afterwards *ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί*, Luke iii. 16; Acts i. 5; xi. 16 *βαπτίζειν ὕδατι*, but *βαπτ. ἐν ὕδατι* Matt. iii. 11; Jno. i. 26, 33.[1] This difference in phraseology does not affect the sense, but each form of expression arose from a different conception: *πάσχειν ἐν σαρκί* means, *suffer in the flesh* (body); *πάσχειν σαρκί* means, *suffer according to* (as respects) *the flesh* (§ 31, 6). *Βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι* signifies, *baptize in water* (immersing); *βαπτίζειν ὕδατι*, *baptize with water*. Here, and in most other passages,
367 the identity of the two expressions in *sense* is manifest;[2] yet we must not
6th ed. consider one as put for the other. Cf. besides, Eph. ii. 1 *νεκροὶ τοῖς παρα-*
385 *πτώμασι* but Col. ii. 13 *νεκροὶ ἐν τοῖς παραπτ.*, 2 Cor. iv. 7 *ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολὴ*
7th ed. *τῆς δυνάμεως ᾖ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐξ ἡμῶν*, Matt. vii. 2; cf. Luke vi. 38; 1 Jno. iii. 18.

4. It was formerly supposed (Glassii Philol. sacr. ed. Dathe

[1] But invariably only *βαπτίζ. ἐν πνεύματι.*

[2] So in Arist. anim. 4, 10, p. 111 Sylb. *λαμβάνεσθαι τριώδοντι* is, caught *with* a trident (like *τῇ χειρί with* the hand); but *ληφθῆναι ἐν τῷ τριώδοντι*, immediately following, is *caught on the trident*. *Schneider* and *Bekker*, however, read in the latter passage *ληφθῆναι ἄν*.

I. 412 sq.) that in the N. T. the prepositions ἐν and εἰς especially were used indiscriminately for each other (see also Sturz, Lexic. Xen. II. 68, 166). The former, it was said, was employed agreeably to the Hebrew idiom with verbs of motion or direction to denote *into*, as Matt. x. 16 ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα ἐν μέσῳ λύκων, Jno. v. 4 ἄγγελος κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, Luke vii. 17 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, Mark v. 30 ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ἐπιστραφείς, Rom. v. 5 ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν, Luke v. 16; Jno. viii. 37; 1 Cor. xi. 18, etc. (in Rev. xi. 11 the reading is very uncertain, and Mark i. 16; 1 Tim. iii. 16 do not come under this head). The latter, it was imagined, was used with verbs of rest to signify *in*, as Acts vii. 4 (ἡ γῆ) εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν κατοικεῖτε, Mark ii. 1 εἰς οἶκόν ἐστι, Jno. i. 18 ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός, ix. 7 νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν etc.[1] 432

a. Now first in reference to ἐν: the Greeks also, particularly Homer, sometimes use ἐν with verbs of motion to indicate at the same time the result of the motion, that is, *rest*.[2] This they do from a love of terseness peculiar to the Greek race. It is only in later writers, however, that such use of ἐν appears in prose (for Thuc. 4, 42; 7, 17; Xen. H. 7, 5, 10 have now been emended on MS. authority, Mtth. 1343), e.g. Aelian. 4, 18 κατῆλθε Πλάτων ἐν Σικελίᾳ i.e. *he came (and dwelt) in Sicily*, Paus. 6, 20, 4 αὐτοὶ κομίσαι φασὶ τῆς Ἱπποδαμείας τὰ ὀστᾶ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ, 7, 4, 3 etc.; Alciphr. 2, 3, p. 227 Wagn.; Xen. Eph. 2, 12; Arrian. Epict. 1, 11, 32; Aesop. 16, 127, 343 de Fur.; Dio Cass. 1288, 23; cf. Heind. Plat. Soph. p. 427 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 178 sq.; Schaef. Demosth. III. p. 505. The same explanation applies likewise to Matt. x. 16; Rev. xi. 11,[3] and perhaps also (with BCrus.) to Jno. v. 4, especially if these words are a later addition; for the other 368 6th ed.

[1] The above observation must be confined to the two cases specified; for when ἐν and εἰς might according to different conceptions be used with equal propriety, it could not be said that one is put for the other, e.g. τοῦτο ἐγένετό μοι, or τοῦτο ἐγένετο εἰς ἐμέ.

[2] The same remark applies to the Hebrew בְּ when it appears to be joined to verbs of motion, see my exeg. Studien I. 49 ff. Further, cf. *Krebs*, obs. 78 f. — ἥκω ἐν does not come under this head (Lucian. paras. 34; cf. *Poppo*, Thuc. III. II. 891). Neither can Perfects or Pluperfects with ἐν, as καταπεφευγέναι ἐν τόπῳ Plat. Soph. 260 c.; Thuc. 4, 14, etc., be considered as parallel with the above examples. They show, however, the origin of this usage, cf. *Bhdy.* 208; and in good writers the usage is generally confined to such cases only, *Krü.* S. 286. Finally, the (not infrequent) construction ἔρχεσθαι ἐν Luke ix. 46; xxiii. 42; Rev. xi. 11, etc. is perhaps to be also excepted when it denotes *come (arise) in*.

[3] The fact that εἰσέρχεσθαι ἐν appears to be an imitation of the Hebrew בּ֣וֹא בְּ makes no difference, as this Hebrew expression is undoubtedly to be explained in the same way.

exposition, *went down in the pool* (into the depths, to produce the
386 ταραχή, see Lücke), is opposed by the consideration, that then in
Tisch. so circumstantial a narrative a descent of the angel from heaven
433 would first of all have been mentioned. In all other passages the substitution of ἐν for εἰς is merely apparent: Luke vii. 17 means *went forth* (*spread*) *in all Judea;* Mark v. 30 ἐπιστραφεὶς ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ *turned him about* (turned around) *in the crowd*, Luke v. 16 ἦν ὑποχωρῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις continued retired *in the solitary places*. If the reading is genuine in Matt. xiv. 3, ἔθετο ἐν φυλακῇ exactly corresponds to the Latin ponere *in loco* (for which we, according to a different but equally correct conception, say *put into*); similar is Jno. iii. 35 πάντα δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, 2 Cor. viii. 16 (Iliad. 1, 441; 5, 574; cf. also Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. I. 598). In the same way, Matt. xxvi. 23 ὁ ἐμβάψας ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ is, he that dippeth *in the dish*, an expression as correct as the German *in die Schüssel* eintaucht, dippeth *into the dish* (cf. Aesop. 124, 1). In 1 Cor. xi. 18 συνερχ. ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ means, meet *in an assembly* (as we say, meet in the market-place, in company, etc.). In Phil. iv. 16 ὅτι καὶ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ ... εἰς τὴν χρείαν μου ἐπέμψατε the expression is abbreviated: *ye sent to me* (when I was) *in Thessalonica* (cf. Thuc. 4, 27 and Poppo, in loc.). As to Jno. viii. 37 there may be doubt how ἐν ὑμῖν is to be taken, see Lücke; but there can be no doubt that ἐν is not put for εἰς. As to Jas. v. 5 see de Wette. In Matt. xxvii. 5 ἐν τῷ ναῷ is, *in* the temple. In Rom. v. 5 the use of the Perfect was sufficient to indicate the correct interpretation (cf. Poppo, Thuc. 4, 14).[1]

b. More surprising still are the passages adduced in support of the assertion that εἰς is used for ἐν. Even in Greek authors εἰς is not unfrequently construed with verbs of rest; and then the idea of *motion* (preceding or accompanying) was originally included, agreeably to the principle of *breviloquentia* mentioned above (Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 467; Acta Monac. I. 64 sq.; II. 47; Schaef. Demosth. I. 194 sq.; Schoem. Plutarch. Agis 162 sq.; Hm. Soph. Aj. 80; Jacobs, Ael. anim. p. 406, and, as to Latin, Hartung on the Cases S. 68 ff.), as Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 4 νόμῳ εἰς τὰς ἑαυτῶν χώρας ἕκαστοι τούτων πάρεισιν, Aelian. 7, 8 Ἡφαιστίων εἰς Ἐκβάτανα ἀπέθανε, Isaeus 5, 46 (cf. Acts xxi. 13),[2] Diod. S. 5, 84 διατρίβων

[1] Passages of Greek authors in which some have erroneously thought ἐν is put for εἰς, have been more correctly explained by *Ellendt*, Arrian. Al. I. 247. As to εἰς for ἐν, see *ibid.* II. 91. As to Latin phrases in which *in* with Ablat. appeared to be used for *in* with Acc., see *Kritz*, Sallust. II. 31 sq.

[2] Εἰς χωρίον τῆς Ἀρκαδίας θνήσκει Steph. Byz. p. 495 Mein. is to be explained in a different manner.

εἰς τὰς νήσους Paus. 7, 4, 3. (The use of εἰς with such verbs as 434
ἴζειν, καθέζεσθαι — καθῆσθαι — Mark xiii. 3, cf. Eurip. Iph. T. 620,
is of a somewhat different nature, see Bttm. Dem. Mid. p. 175; 369
Schweigh. Lexic. Herod. I. p. 282; Valcken. Herod. 8, 71 etc.; 6th ed.
Poppo, Thuc. III. I. p. 659; Fr. Mr. p. 558.) In this way are to 387
be explained the following passages: Mark ii. 1, where we say in 7th ed.
German also *er ist ins Haus*, i.e. he has gone into the house and
is now there (Her. 1, 21; Arrian. Al. 4, 22, 3; Paus. 8, 10, 4 and
Siebelis in loc.; Liv. 37, 18? Curt. 3, 5, 10; Vechner, hellenol.
p. 258 sq.) cf. xiii. 16; Luke xi. 7; Acts viii. 40 Φίλιππος εὑρέθη
εἰς Ἄζωτον Philip *was found* conducted *to* Azotus (cf. vs. 39 πνεῦμα
κυρίου ἥρπασε τὸν Φίλ., see Wesseling. Diod. Sic. II. 581; cf.
Esth. i. 5; Evang. apocr. p. 447); Acts vii. 4 εἰς ἣν ὑμεῖς νῦν
κατοικεῖτε (Xen. A. 1, 2, 24; Xen. Eph. 2, 12; Theodoret. Opp.
I. 594), Mark x. 10 (where the position of the words is to be
noted); probably also Acts xviii. 21 δεῖ με τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην
ποιῆσαι εἰς Ἱεροσ., but the genuineness of these words is suspected
and the more recent editors have omitted them, [they are wanting,
too, in Cod. Sin.]; Jno. xx. 7 ἐντετυλιγμένον εἰς ἕνα τόπον *wrapt
together* (and put) *into one place*. On the other hand, in Acts
xii. 19 εἰς Καισάρειαν belongs grammatically to κατελθών. In Acts
xx. 14 εἰς signifies *to*. In Acts xix. 22 ἔπεσχε χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν,
probably εἰς is not used simply in a local sense: *he remained in
Asia*; but, he remained *for* Asia, in order to labor there longer.
The only admissible interpretation of Acts iv. 5 συναχθῆναι αὐτῶν
τοὺς ἄρχοντας . . . εἰς Ἱεροσ. is that of Beza; yet the good Codd.
[Sin. excepted] give ἐν. In Acts ii. 39 the οἱ εἰς μακράν are those
dwelling *at a distance, — afar off*. In Jno. i. 18 ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν
κόλπον (though here said in reference to God) is probably to be
referred to the primary (external and local) import: who is
(laid) *upon* (unto) *the bosom*.[1] In Jno. ix. 7 εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν
is as respects sense to be connected also with ὕπαγε, cf. vs. 11: *go
into the pool and wash thyself* (cf. Luke xxi. 37) see Lücke, though
νίπτεσθαι εἰς ὕδωρ by itself is as correct as in Cato R. R. 156, 5
in aquam macerare, or *sich in ein Becken waschen* (Arrian. Epict. 435

[1] Cf. with this as analogous *in aurem, oculum dormire* Terent. Heaut. 2, 2, 101; Plin. epp. 4, 29; Plaut. Pseud. 1, 1, 121. *De Wette* rejects the above explanation, "as here at least quite inadmissible." But why should not such figurative expressions, transferred from human relations to God, be taken in the sense which primarily belongs to them, the sense in which they had their origin? The phrase is in existence; when transferred to immaterial relations it is taken just as it stands, without further thought respecting the physical relation in which it originated.

3, 22, 71).[1] Still more easy of explanation is Mark i. 9 *ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην*. In Luke viii. 34 *ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν* etc. means, *they carried the news into the city* (for which we find a more circumstantial statement in Matt. viii. 33: *ἀπελθόντες εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἀπήγγειλαν πάντα* etc.). Not unlike this is Mark i. 39; cf. Jno. viii. 26. In Mark xiii. 9 *καὶ εἰς συναγωγὰς δαρήσεσθε*, where *ἐν* though it has some slight MSS. support is clearly a correction,
388 the words *εἰς συναγωγάς* cannot well (Mey.) be joined to the
7th ed. preceding *παραδώσουσι* without quite destroying the parallelism. The most literal rendering, *ye shall be beaten into the synagogues*,
370 presents no archaeological difficulty; still, one would have sooner
6th ed. expected the beating *in* the synagogues. The pregnant construction, however: brought *into the synagogues*, *ye shall be beaten*, is harsh for Mark. Luke iv. 23 *ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς Καπερναούμ* may be rendered: *done* (*towards*) *unto Capernaum*, cf. Acts xxviii. 6; and *ἐν*, which some good Codd. give, is undoubtedly a correction.[2] See, generally, Beyer de praeposs. *ἐν* et *εἰς* in N. T. permutatione. Lips. 1824. 4to.[3]

5. If we turn now, further, to several passages of the N. T. Epistles where these prepositions (particularly *ἐν* for *εἰς*) are supposed to be interchanged when used in an ideal sense (cf. also Rück. Gal. i. 6), probably nobody will find any difficulty with 2 Tim. iii. 16; Heb. iii. 12; 2 Pet. ii. 13; — quite as little with Eph. i. 17; vi. 15. In Phil. i. 9 *ἵνα ἀγάπη . . . περισσεύῃ ἐν ἐπιγνώσει* means *in* knowledge; the purpose, on the other hand, is first expressed by *εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν* vs. 10. So too in Philem. 6 *ὅπως ἡ κοινωνία τῆς πίστεώς σου ἐνεργὴς γένηται ἐν ἐπιγνώσει*. In Jas. v. 5 *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σφαγῆς* means — as is plain from its parallelism with *ἐθησαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* vs. 3 — *in the day of slaughter*, which also makes good sense, see Theile in loc. In Eph. ii. 16

[1] Jer. xli. (xlviii.) 7 וַיִּשְׁחָטֵם אֶל־תּוֹךְ הַבּוֹר *ἔσφαξεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ φρέαρ he slew* (and cast) *them into the pit*. Cf. 1 Macc. vii. 19.

[2] Soph. Aj. 80 *ἐμοὶ ἀρκεῖ τοῦτον ἐς δόμους μένειν* can no longer be adduced; as *Lob.* has shown that the true reading is *ἐν δόμοις*. See also *Wunder* on *Lobeck's* edit. S. 92 f. As to Xen. C. 2, 1, 9, however, see *Bornem.* in the Index, under *εἰς*. Also Lycurg. 20, 3 *διακαρτερεῖν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα* is not: they were stedfast *in* their country.

[3] Originally *ἐν* and *ἐς* (*εἰς*) may have been one and the same preposition, as in Pindar we find agreeably to the Aeolic dialect *ἐν* with Acc. for *εἰς*; see Pindar ed. *Böckh*, I. p. 294, 378, etc. As little, however, can be argued from this in support of an interchange of these two prepositions in the cultivated written language of the Greeks with its established forms, as that in German at the present day *vor* and *für* may be arbitrarily interchanged because in the earlier language they were properly only one and the same word.

ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι points to εἰς ἕνα καινὸν ἄνθρωπον; accordingly, he 436
reconciles to God ἐν ἑνὶ σώματι those κτισθέντας εἰς ἕνα ἄνθρ. In Rom. i. 24 εἰς ἀκαθαρσ. is to be joined directly to παρέδωκεν, and ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθ. is *in their lusts*, cf. vs. 27 ἐν τῇ ὀρέξει αὐτῶν. In 1 Cor. i. 8 ἐν τῇ ἡμ. is construed with ἀνεγκλήτους, and this is in apposition to ὑμᾶς. In the same way, in 1 Thess. iii. 13, ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ, which is parallel to ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ, depends directly on ἀμέμπτους. In 2 Thess. ii. 13 εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος etc. means, *chosen to salvation in sanctification of the Spirit; ἁγιασμ. πν.* is the spiritual state in which the *being chosen to salvation* is realized. 1 Jno. iv. 9 is simply: *in this was manifested the love of God on* (as respects) *us.* On the other hand, in Rom. ii. 5 θησαυρίζεις σεαυτῷ ὀργὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς is an abbreviated expression: *thou art treasuring up to thyself wrath* (which will break forth) *on the day of wrath.* And 1 Thess. iv. 7 οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἀλλὰ ἐν ἁγιασμῷ is put for ὥστε εἶναι 389
(ἡμᾶς) ἐν ἁγιασμῷ. 1 Cor. vii. 15 and Eph. iv. 4 may also be 7th ed.
explained in the same way; others, however, understand ἐν to refer to the ethical nature of the κλῆσις, see, especially, Harless on the latter passage. Moreover, in 1 Cor. the Perfect is not to be overlooked. As to διδόναι ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις 2 Cor i. 22 and the 371
like (Rom. v. 5) no remark is necessary after what has been said 6th ed.
above, p. 414. Finally, εἰς is not put for ἐν in Rom. vi. 22 ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν; the εἰς manifestly designates the moral goal. Similar is Rom. xiii. 14. In Eph. iii. 16 κραταιοῦσθαι εἰς τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον means, *to become strong in regard to the inward man.* In general, it is inherently improbable that in clearly conceived doctrinal statements the apostles should have perplexed the reader by employing ἐν for εἰς or εἰς for ἐν. At least, they could have written εἰς with as much ease, certainly, as the expositors who are trying to smuggle it in.

The alleged usage of indiscriminately interchanging these prepositions is not sustained by an appeal to Suidas and the Fathers;[1] nor by the fact that sometimes in parallel passages εἰς and ἐν exchange places, as Matt. xxi. 8 ἔστρωσαν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, but Mark xi. 8 εἰς τὴν ὁδόν; Matt. xxiv. 18 ὁ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω, Mark xiii. 16 ὁ εἰς τὸν ἀγρόν etc.; Mark i. 16 ἀμφιβάλλοντες ἀμφίβληστρον ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, Matt. iv. 18 βαλλ. 437

[1] The words of 2 Cor. xii. 2 ἁρπαγέντα ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ are quoted by Clem. Alex. paedag. I. p. 44 Sylb. thus: ἐν τρίτῳ ἁρπασθεὶς οὐρανῷ; on the other hand, those of Prov. xvii. 3 δοκιμάζεται ἐν καμίνῳ ἄργυρος etc. are quoted by him in Strom. II. p. 172 as follows: δοκιμ. . . . εἰς κάμινον.

ἀμφίβλ. εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν — the former means, *they cast the net about* (waved it about) *in the sea;* the latter, *they cast it into the sea;* different stages and acts of their business are indicated. In Rom. v. 21 ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ *in death*, which is actually present; but ἵνα ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον *unto life*, as the end to be attained; probably, however, εἰς ζ. αἰών. depends directly on δικ. see Fr.; cf. besides 2 Cor. xiii. 3. It must, however, be admitted that the limitation according to which εἰς is construed with verbs of rest and ἐν on the other hand with verbs of motion, is overlooked by writers of the later period, especially by the Scholiasts[1] and Byzantines, and so ἐν and εἰς are employed without distinction, and ἐν even begins to predominate with verbs of motion, see Leo Diac. ed. Hase p. XII.; Blume, Lycurg. p. 56; Niebuhr, ind. to Agath., also the indices to Theophan. and to Menandri hist. in the Bonn ed.[2] The modern Greeks, in fact, have retained but one of these prepositions. Cf. further, Argum. ad Demosth. Androt. § 17; Theodoret. Opp. II. 466, 804; III. 869; Epiphan. haer. 46, 5; Pseudepiph. vit. proph. pp. 241, 248, 332, 334, 340, 341; Basilic. I. 150; III. 496, also the Sept.
390 the Apocr. and the Pseudepigr.[3] in many passages. Yet in the N. T.
7th ed. there is at least no instance more anomalous than those which occur in the earlier writers of the κοινή.

372 6. It is especially characteristic of Paul to use several prepositions
6th ed referring to one and the same substantive, in order that together they may define his idea on all sides, e.g. Gal. i. 1 Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου, ἀλλὰ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρός etc. i.e. an apostle sent forth in no respect by human authority (not *from* men, as the ultimate authority; not *through* any man, as intermediate authority); Rom. iii. 22 (πεφανέρωται) δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας, i.e. is most completely imparted to all believers (is manifested *unto* all and *over* (upon) all), Syriac ܠܟܠܗܘ ܘܥܠ ܟܠܗܘ (Bengel in loc. is arbitrary, following the ancient expositors: Rück. helpless); xi. 36 ἐξ αὐτοῦ (θεοῦ) καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ πάντα, i.e. the world bears every possible dependent relation to God, — it is *from* (out of) him, inasmuch as he
438 created it (the First Cause); *through* him, inasmuch as he is

[1] Compare *Hm.* on *Böckh's* Behandl. d. Inschrift. S. 181 f.

[2] Niceph. Constant. p. 48 τυφλώσας ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐξέπεμψε, Theophan. p. 105 Γρηγόριος παῤῥησιαστικώτερον ἐδίδασκεν . . . εἰς τὸ εὐκτήριον τῆς ἁγίας ἀναστάσεως, p. 62, 65, 68; Malal. 18, 467.

[3] Cf. *Wahl*, Clav. apocr. pp. 165, 195; *Fabric.* Pseudepigr. I. 598, 629; *Brtschn.* lexic. man. p. 139; Acta apocr. pp. 5, 13, 38, 65, 66, 68, 71, 88, 91, 93, 94, 263, and on almost every page.

(perpetually) efficient upon it; *to* him, inasmuch as he is the ultimate End to which all things are directed;[1] Col. i. 16 ἐν αὐτῷ (Χριστῷ) ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα ... τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν ἔκτισται, i.e. the universe stands in necessary and complete relation to Christ; first, historically (Aor.): *in him* was the world created, inasmuch as he, the divine λόγος, was the personal ground of the divine creative act (just as *in* Christ God redeemed the world); then of the world as subsisting (Perf.): all things have been created *through* (by) him (as mediate person), and *to* (for) him (as κύριος πάντων in the most comprehensive sense); in vs. 17 πρὸ πάντων refers back to δι' αὐτοῦ, and ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν is explanatory of εἰς αὐτόν. Eph. iv. 6 εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡμῖν, i.e. God is the God and Father of all in every conceivable relation, (ruling) *over* all, (working) *through* all, (dwelling) *in* all (filling them with his Spirit). 2 Pet. iii. 5 γῆ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ δι' ὕδατος συνεστῶσα τῷ θεοῦ λόγῳ *out of* water (as the material in which it lay contained) and *through* water, i.e. through the action of the water, which partly retired to the low places, and partly formed the clouds in the sky. In the parallel clauses in 1 Cor. xii. 8 f. spiritual gifts are referred, by the use of διά, κατά, ἐν, to the πνεῦμα from which they all originate: διά designates the Spirit as mediate agent; κατά, as disposer (vs. 11); ἐν, as container. The antithesis between ἐκ (or ἀπό) and εἰς (the point *from* and the point *towards*) is easily perceived, Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. iii. 18 (cf. in a local reference Matt. xxiii. 34). (In 1 Cor. viii. 6, where the corresponding prepositions refer to different subjects — θεὸς ἐξ οὗ and κύρ. Ἰ. Χρ. δι' οὗ — there cannot be a moment's doubt respecting the propriety and import of the prepositions.) 391 7th ed.

The following instances in Greek authors deserve notice as parallel: Mr. Anton. 4, 23 ἐκ σοῦ (ὦ φύσις) πάντα, ἐν σοὶ πάντα, εἰς σὲ πάντα, Heliod. 2, 25 πρὸ πάντων καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν, Philostr. Apoll. 3, 25 τοὺς ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ τε καὶ ἐν θαλάττῃ, Isocr. big. p. 846 τὰ μὲν ὑφ' ὑμῶν, τὰ δὲ μεθ' ὑμῶν, τὰ δὲ δι' ὑμᾶς, τὰ δ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, Acta Ignat. p. 368 δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ τῷ πατρὶ ἡ δόξα. Other instances may be seen in Wetst. II. 77 and Fr. Rom. II. 556. 373 6th ed.

7. When two or more substantives dependent on the same preposition immediately follow one another joined together by a copula, 439

[1] *Theodoret* has thus explained the passage: αὐτὸς τὰ πάντα πεποίηκεν, αὐτὸς τὰ γεγονότα διατελεῖ κυβερνῶν ... εἰς αὐτὸν ἀφορᾶν ἅπαντας προσήκει ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ὑπαρξάντων χάριν ὁμολογοῦντας, αἰτοῦντας δὲ τὴν ἔπειτα προμήθειαν, αὐτῷ δὲ χρὴ καὶ τὴν προσήκουσαν ἀναπέμπειν δοξολογίαν.

the preposition is most naturally repeated, if the substantives in question denote things which are to be conceived as distinct and independent, Weber, Demosth. p. 189 (as to Latin, see Kritz, Sallust. I. 226; Zumpt, Gr. S. 601 f.); but not repeated, if the substantives fall under a single category, or (if proper names) under one common class:

a. Luke xxiv. 27 *ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν* (Acts xv. 4); 1 Thess. i. 5 *ἐν δυνάμει καὶ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ*, Jno. xx. 2;[1] 2 Tim. iii. 11; Acts xxviii. 2; Mark vi. 4; x. 29; xii. 33; Rev. vi. 9. Hence it is almost always repeated when two nouns are connected together by *καὶ ... καί* (Bremi, Lys. p. 3 sq.) or *τε ... καί*, as in Acts xxvi. 29 *καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ* (the two are incompatible with each other), Luke xxii. 33; 1 Cor. ii. 3; Philem. 16; Acts xvii. 9; cf. Xen. Hier. 1, 5 (but Soph. Trach. 379); Phil. i. 7 *ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ*, Acts xxv. 23 etc. (cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 6, 16; Thuc. 8, 97; Diod. S. 19, 86; 20, 15; Paus. 4, 8, 2).[2]

b. Jno. iv. 23 *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ* (two aspects of one comprehensive notion) see Lücke, Luke xxi. 26 *ἀπὸ φόβου καὶ προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπερχομένων* (essentially *one* state of mind), Eph. i. 21; 1 Thess. i. 8; Acts xvi. 2; xvii. 15 (cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 7; Arist. Eth. Nic. 7, 11 in.; Thuc. 3, 72; 2, 83; Paus. 10, 20, 2), also when the substantives are connected by *τε ... καί*, as in Acts xxviii. 23 *ἀπό τε τοῦ νόμου Μωσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν*, i. 8; xxvi. 20 (Franke, Demosth. p. 65), Paus. 10, 37, 2; 25, 23; Xen. Hell. 1, 1, 3; Herod. 6, 3, 2. For instances with proper names, see Acts vi. 9 *τῶν ἀπὸ*
392 *Κιλικίας καὶ Ἀσίας*, xiv. 21 *ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Λύστραν καὶ Ἰκό-*
7th ed. *νιον καὶ Ἀντιόχειαν*, xvi. 2; ix. 31; Matt. iv. 25.

If the substantives are connected *disjunctively* or *antithetically*, the preposition is in the former case usually, and in the latter always, repeated, Col. iii. 17 *ὅ τι ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ*, ii. 16; Matt. vii. 16; xvii. 25; Luke xx. 4; Jno. vii. 48; Acts iv. 7; viii. 34; Rom. iv. 9; 1 Cor. iv. 3, 21; xiv. 6; Rev. xiii. 16; cf. Paus. 7, 10, 1 (the contrary only in Heb. x. 28 *ἐπὶ δυσὶν ἢ τρισὶ μάρτυσιν*, 1 Tim. v. 19); Rom. iv. 10 *οὐκ ἐν περιτομῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν*
440 *ἀκροβυστίᾳ*, vi. 15; viii. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 5; xi. 17; 2 Cor. i. 12; iii. 3;

[1] On this passage *Bengel* remarks: ex praepos. repetita colligi potest, non una fuisse utrumque discipulum.

[2] As to the various cases in which Greek prose writers repeat a preposition after *τε καί*, see *Sommer* in the Jahrb. f. Philol. 1831. S. 408 f.; cf. *Stallb.* Phileb. p. 156· *Weber*, Dem. 189.

Eph. i. 21; vi. 12; Jno. vii. 22; xvii. 9, etc. (Alciphr. 1, 31).[1] Lastly, in comparisons the preposition is always repeated, Acts xi. 18; Rom. v. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 2; Heb. iv. 10 (as to Greek authors, see Schaef. Julian. p. 19 sq.; Held, Plut. Aem. 124; Krü. 284). In general, there is a greater tendency to repeat the preposition in the N. T. than in Greek prose (Bhdy. 201; Krüg. 284 f.; Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 229), which frequently or usually omits the preposition, not only before a noun simply connected with one preceding (Bornem. Xen. conv. 159), but also after *ἀλλά* or *ἤ* (Schaef. Dem. V. 569, 760; Plutarch. IV. 291; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 493; Weber, Dem. 389; Franke, Dem. 6) before words in apposition (Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 112, 247; cf. Bornem. Schol. p. 173) and in answers (Stallb. Plat. sympos. p. 104 sq.; Gorg. p. 38; rep. I. 237). On the other hand, the following passages are singular even in the N. T.: Acts xxvi. 18 *ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν*, vii. 38; 1 Cor. x. 28; Heb. vii. 27, but cf. Aristot. Eth. Nicom. 10, 9, 1 *περί τε τούτων καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ φιλίας* etc. (see Zell, Aristot. Eth. p. 442); Lysias 1, in Theomnest. 7; Dion. H. IV. 2223, 1; Diog. L. prooem. 6; Strabo 16, 778; Diod. Sic. 5, 31; Plutarch. Sol. c. 3. 374 6th ed.

In Jude 1 *ἐν* is not to be repeated from the preceding clause before Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, as that would be harsh; but Ἰησ. Χρ. is the dativus commodi: *kept for Christ*. Before a noun in apposition the preposition is regularly not repeated, Luke xxiii. 51; Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 4; it is only in cases of epexegetic apposition that the repetition can take place, Rom. ii. 28 *ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ περιτομή*, Jno. xi. 54, (in 1 Jno. v. 20 there is no apposition). So also in the classics, though usually only when the word in apposition is separated from the principal substantive, Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 127; Mtth. 1402.

The repetition of the preposition before each of a series of nouns succeeding one another without connectives, as in Eph. vi. 12 *ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας ... πρὸς τὰ πνεύμ.* etc., Jno. xvi. 8 (cf. Arist. rhet. 2, 10, 2), is of a rhetorical nature or serves to give greater prominence to the several particulars, see Dissen, Pind. p. 519. 393 7th ed.

The preposition with which the antecedent is construed, is usually in Greek authors not repeated before the relative, as Plat. legg. 10, 909 d. *ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας, ἧς ἂν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτῶν ὄφλῃ τὴν δίκην*, 12, 955 b. *ἐν ἱεροῖς — οἷς ἂν ἐθέλῃ*, 2, 659 b. *ἐκ ταὐτοῦ στόματος, οὗπερ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπεκαλέσατο* etc. 441

[1] But in such antitheses the preposition is not repeated before an adjective, as 1 Pet. i. 23 *οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ ἀφθάρτου*.

Plat. Phaed. 21; Gorg. 453 e.; Lach. 192 b.; Thuc. 1, 28; Xen. conv 4, 1; An. 5, 7, 17; Hiero 1, 11; Aristot. probl. 26, 4 and 16; Paus. 9, 39, 4; cf. Bremi, Lys. p. 201; Schaef. Soph. III. 317; Dion. comp. p. 325, Melet. p. 124; Demosth. II. 200; Heller, Soph. Oed. C. p. 420; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 108; Wurm, Dinarch. p. 93; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 291; Bhdy. 203 f.

375 6th ed. So, in the N. T., Acts xiii. 39 *ἀπὸ πάντων, ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ... δικαιωθῆναι, δικαιοῦται*, xiii. 2 *ἀφορίσατε ... εἰς τὸ ἔργον, ὃ προσκέκλημαι αὐτούς*, Luke i. 25; xii. 46; Matt. xxiv. 50; Rev. ii. 13 (not 1 Cor. vii. 20); on the contrary, Jno. iv. 53 *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ, ἐν ᾗ εἶπεν*, Acts vii. 4; xx. 18 (Jon. iv. 10) cf. Demosth. Timoth. 705 b. *ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις, ἐν οἷς γέγραπται τὴν τιμὴν τῶν φιαλῶν ὀφείλων*, Aristot. anim. 5, 30; Plat. Soph. 257 d.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 2, 4; Diog. L. 8, 68; Heinich. Euseb. II. 252. As to the Lat. see Ramshorn S. 378; Beier, Cic. offic. I. 123. The Greek authors, also, readily repeat the preposition when the relative is separated by several words from the antecedent, Her. 1, 47; Xen. vectig. 4, 13; Lucian. necyom. 9; Dio Chr. 17, 247.

In Greek authors, and especially in the poets, a preposition belonging to two successive nouns is sometimes, as is well known, expressed only once and that before the second noun, Hm. Vig. p. 854; Lob. Soph. Aj. v. 397 sq., the comment. on Anacr. 9, 22; Kühner II. 320 etc. Such an instance has been supposed to occur in Phil. ii. 22 (Heinich. Euseb. II. 252) *ὅτι, ὡς πατρὶ τέκνον, σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν* etc. But the passage contains rather a variatio structurae. Paul uses *σὺν ἐμοί*, bethinking himself that he cannot well say *ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν*: he has, as a child serves his father, served *with me*, etc. See, in general, the opposite remarks of Bhdy. p. 202; cf. however, Franke, Dem. p. 30.

Note 1. It is a peculiarity of later Greek, in particular, to combine a preposition with an adverb, especially of place or time (Krü. 266 f.), — either so as to make the preposition modify the meaning of the adverb, as in *ἀπὸ πρωΐ* Acts xxviii. 23, *ἀπὸ πέρυσι* 2 Cor. viii. 10; ix. 2, *ἀπ' ἄρτι* Matt. xxvi. 29, *ἀπὸ τότε* Matt. iv. 17 [xvi. 21] xxvi. 16 [Luke xvi. 16], *ἔκπαλαι* 2 Pet. ii. 3, *ὑπερλίαν* 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii. 11 (cf. *ὑπέρευ* Xen. Hiero 6, 9); or so as to blend with an expressive adverb a preposition that seemed weakened by diversified usage (cf. in German: *oben auf dem Dache*), as *ὑποκάτω, ὑπεράνω, κατέναντι*. Sometimes also an adverb is strengthened by the preposition, as *παραυτίκα*. To this class belong likewise such numerals as *ἐφάπαξ* Rom. vi. 10 etc. (Dio Cass. 1091, 91; 1156, 13, analogous to *ἐσάπαξ* Franke, Demosth. p. 30, *πρὸς ἅπαξ* Malal. 7, p. 178), *ἐπὶ τρίς*

294 7th ed. Acts x. 16; xi. 10 (among the examples adduced by Kypke II. 48 is the analogous *εἰς τρίς*, which occurs in Her. 1, 86; Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 4; cf. Hm. Vig. p. 857). Many of these compounds are to be found only in writers

442 that flourished after the time of Alexander,[1] some only in Scholiasts, Lob.

[1] Yet *ἐς ἀεί, ἐς ἔπειτα, ἐς ὀψέ*, and the like, occur even in Thuc. 1, 129, 130; 4, 63; 8, 23. As to *ἀπὸ μακρόθεν*, and the like, see § 65, 2, p. 603.

Phryn. p. 46 sqq.; cf., however, Kühner II. 315; several, such as ἀπὸ πέρυσι (for which προπέρυσι or ἐκπέρυσι), are not to be met with even there. Further, cf. Sept. ἀπὸ ὄπισθεν (מֵאַחֲרֵי) 1 Sam. xii. 20 and Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 25. (Consistency in the mode of writing these compounds, whether connected Krü. 266 or separated, has not been observed even by the most recent editors of the N. T.)

Note 2. The antique usage of employing (simple) prepositions without a case for *adverbs*, has been retained, with certain restrictions, in the prose 376
style of all periods, Bhdy. 196. In the N. T. we find but a single example 6th ed.
of this: 2 Cor. xi. 23 διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσίν; — ὑπὲρ ἐγώ *I more.* The instances which Kypke adduces in loc. are not all similar. Usually in prose such prepositions are supported by a δέ or γε (μετὰ δέ is especially frequent) Bhdy. 198. Πρός *in addition, besides*, may be best compared with the above passage, e.g. Dem. 1 Aphob. 556a.; Franke, Demosth. p. 94. The form ἔνι with the accent thrown back for ἐνί (ἐν), including the substantive verb, occurs several times, see p. 80; Bornem. (Stud. u. Krit. 1843. S. 108 f.) attempted, but on insufficient grounds, to introduce ἄπο *far from* (Bttm. II. 378) in Matt. xxiv. 1.

§ 51. USE OF PREPOSITIONS IN CIRCUMLOCUTIONS.

1. When a preposition with a noun forms a circumlocution for an adverb or (mostly with the aid of the article) for an adjective, the propriety of such a use of the preposition must be shown by a reference to its fundamental signification;[1] a merely empirical treatment might lead to erroneous conclusions. Note, then,

a. Ἀπό; e.g. ἀπὸ μέρους Rom. xi. 25; 2 Cor. i. 14 *in part* (*from* a part *hitherwards*), ἀπὸ μιᾶς (γνώμης) Luke xiv. 18 *unanimously* (proceeding *from one* determination), with one mind.

b. Διά with the Genitive usually denotes a mental state viewed as something mediate, a means: in Heb. xii. 1 δι' ὑπομονῆς may 443
be rendered, with (*through*) patience, *patiently*, assidue (similarly Rom. viii. 25 δι' ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα etc., cf. δι' ἀφροσύνης *imprudenter* Xen. C. 3, 1, 18, δι' εὐλαβείας *timide* Dion. H. III. 395
1360, see Pflugk, Eur. Hel. p. 41), cf. also e.g. δι' ἀσφαλείας Thuc. 7th ed.
1, 17. Of a different nature is Heb. xiii. 22 διὰ βραχέων ἐπέστειλα ὑμῖν *breviter* — properly *by means of* few (words), paucis — cf. διὰ βραχυτάτων Dem. Pant. 624c., and below, § 64, 5. Used adjectively

[1] This is not altogether without difficulty, chiefly because in different languages different views of the same relation predominate, e.g. ἀπὸ μέρους *zum* Theil, *in* part, ἐκ δεξιῶν *zur* Rechten, *on, at, to* the right, *ab* oriente *gegen* Osten, *on, to, towards* the East. Many phrases, too, arise from abbreviation.

2 Cor. iii. 11 *εἰ τὸ καταργούμενον διὰ δόξης* etc. (above, p. 379), it denotes a quality with which something is invested.

c. *Εἰς* expresses a degree (*unto*) which something reaches, Luke xiii. 11 *εἰς τὸ παντελές completely (perfectly) wholly* (Aelian. 7, 2, *εἰς κάλλιστον* Plat. Euthyd. 275 b., *ἐς τὸ ἀκριβές* Thuc. 6, 82); this, however, can hardly be called a periphrasis for the adverb.

d. *Ἐκ*, e.g. *ἐκ μέρους* 1 Cor. xii. 27 *ex* parte (*forth from* a part). *Ἐκ* is used especially of the *standard* (secundum), as in *ἐκ τῶν νόμων secundum leges, legibus convenienter* (rule of conduct drawn as it were *out of* the laws); hence *ἐξ ἰσότητος* according to equality,
377 *equally* 2 Cor. viii. 13, *ἐκ μέτρου by measure, moderately* Jno. iii. 34;
6th ed. cf. *ἐξ ἀδίκου injuste* Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 18, *ἐξ ἴσου* Her. 7, 135; Plato, rep. 8, 561 b., *ἐκ προσηκόντων* Thuc. 3, 67; see Ast, Plat. legg. p. 267; Bhdy. 230. It also denotes the source: *ἐξ ἀνάγκης* Heb. vii. 12; cf. Thuc. 3, 40; 7, 27; Dio C. 853, 93 (springing *out of* necessity i.e. *necessarily*); the same explanation applies to *ἐκ συμφώνου* 1 Cor. vii. 5 *ex composito*, which, however, under a different aspect (*in consequence of* an agreement), nearly comes under the first use. In the phrases *οἱ ἐκ πίστεως* Gal. iii. 7, *οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς* Acts x. 45, *ὁ ἐξ ἐναντίας* Tit. ii. 8, *οἱ ἐξ ἐριθείας* Rom. ii. 8, and the like, *ἐκ* designates party (dependence on), and consequently belonging to: *those of the faith*, who belong to the faith; who, as it were, side with faith. Cf. Polyb. 10, 16, 6; Thuc. 8, 92. A relation altogether material is expressed in Mark xi. 20 *ἐκ ῥιζῶν* (*out*) *from the roots, radicitus*. The temporal *ἐκ τρίτου* Matt. xxvi. 44 (1 Macc. ix. 1; Babr. 95, 97; 107, 16; Evang. apocr. p. 439; cf. *ἐξ ὑστέρου* Her. 1, 108) and the like (where the German, on the other hand, says *zum* Dritten) *for the third time*, is doubtless most simply, *out of* the third, (commencing) *from* the third; in later authors we find likewise *ἐκ πρώτης* Babr. 71, 2, *ἐκ δευτέρης* 114, 5.

444 e. *Ἐν*. Instances in which *ἐν* with a substantive may be taken adverbially, as *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*, *ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ*, *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* Matt. xxii. 16; Mark xiv. 1; Col. iv. 5; Acts xvii. 31 (*ἐν δίκῃ* Plat. Crat. p. 419 d., *ἐν τάχει* Thuc. 1, 90),[1] need explanation the less, because we too can employ *in* with the corresponding substantive. The substantives usually denote abstract ideas, particularly qualities or dispositions in which one does something. The use of this preposition

[1] But in Jno. iv. 23, the words *ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*, dependent on *προσκυνήσουσιν*, must not be resolved and degraded into the adverbs *πνευματικῶς καὶ ἀληθῶς*; but *ἐν* denotes the sphere in which the *προσκυνεῖν* is exercised.

with a substantive for an adjective is equally plain, as *ἔργα τὰ ἐν* 396
δικαιοσύνῃ, τὸ μένον ἐν δόξῃ (*ἐστί*) 2 Cor. iii. 11, and the like. 7th ed.

2. f. *Ἐπί* is frequently construed with the Gen. of abstract nouns which denote either a quality *with* which a person acts in a given way (*ἐπ' ἀδείας with fearlessness*), or an objective notion with the actual existence of which something accords, as in Mark xii. 32 *ἐπ' ἀληθείας in accordance with truth, truly* (Dio C. 699, 65 ; 727, 82). With the Dat. *ἐπί* indicates, as it were, the ground *on* which something rests, Acts ii. 26 *ἡ σάρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι with, in* hope, confidence (in God) ; hence *securely, tranquilly*. The phrases *ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἐφ' ὅσον, ἐπὶ πολύ* present no difficulty.

g. *Κατά*. The expression *ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία* 2 Cor. viii. 2 is probably to be rendered, *poverty extending to the lowest level*, the deepest poverty (cf. Strabo 9, 419) ; Xen. Cyr. 4, 6, 5 is not parallel to this, *ὁ κατὰ γῆς* means : *terra conditus*. Probably the adverbial phrase *καθ' ὅλου* properly signifies *throughout* (in universum), *in general*, as *κατά* with the Gen. has sometimes this meaning. The use of *κατά* with the Acc. of a substantive in circumlocutions for adverbs, as *κατ' ἐξουσίαν, κατ' ἐξοχήν, κατὰ* 378
γνῶσιν, requires no explanation, see Schaef. Long. p. 330 (cf. *κατὰ* 6th ed.
τάχος Dio. C. 84, 40 ; 310, 93, *κατὰ τὸ ἰσχυρόν* Her. 1, 76, *καθ' ὁρμήν* Soph. Philoct. 562, *κατὰ τὸ ἀνεπιστῆμον* Aeschin. dial. 3, 16, *κατὰ τὸ ὀρθόν* Her. 7, 143), see Bhdy. 241. As to *ἡ κατ' ἐκλογὴν πρόθεσις* Rom. ix. 11, *οἱ κατὰ φύσιν κλάδοι* xi. 21, see § 30, 3, note 5.

h. *Πρός* with the Acc., e.g. Jas. iv. 5 *πρὸς φθόνον invidiose*, cf. *πρὸς ὀργήν* Soph. El. 369 (properly, *according to envy, according to anger*) ; besides, *πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν* Sext. Emp. hypot. 1, 126 for *ἀκριβῶς*.

As to the use of the prepositions *ἐκ, κατά* etc. in circumlocutions for 445
certain cases, especially the Genitive, see § 30, 3, note 5 p. 192 sq.

§ 52. CONSTRUCTION OF VERBS COMPOUNDED WITH PREPOSITIONS.

1. Our attention here will naturally be confined to those compound verbs in which the preposition preserves its peculiar and independent force, and so directly governs a noun different from that governed by the transitive verb ; as, *ἐκβάλλειν to cast out from*, *ἀναφέρειν to bring up upon*, etc. Accordingly, we do not speak

of those in which the signification of the preposition is either obscured (e.g. *ἀποδέχεσθαι*, *ἀποκρίνεσθαι*, *ἀποθνήσκειν*), or blended with that of the verb into *one* general idea (e.g. *μεταδιδόναι impart*, *προάγειν τινά praeire aliquem, precede some one*, *ἀποδεκατοῦν τι to tithe something*, *συγκλείειν τι enclose something*), or, approximating
397 to the nature of an adverb, serves to give intensity to the verb (e.g.
7th ed. *ἐπιζητεῖν*, *διατελεῖν*, *διακαθαρίζειν*, *συντελεῖν*, perpugnare).

The full import of the compound verbs of the N. T., and how far they may be employed for simple verbs, has not yet been investigated thoroughly and on rational principles; cf., however, C. F. Fritzsche: Fischer's and Paulus's Observations on the precise Import of the Prepositions in Greek Compound Verbs, etc. Lips. 1809. 8vo.; Tittmann de vi praepositionum in verbis compos. in N. T. recte diiudicandis, Lips. 1814. 4to. (also in Synonym. N. T. I. 218 sqq.); J. v. Voorst de usu verbor. c. praeposs. compositor. in N. T. Leid. 1818. 2 Spec. 8vo.; Theol. Annal. 1809. II. 474 ff. (Brunck, Aristoph. nub. 987; Zell, Aristotel. ethic. p. 383; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 154). Till very lately translators and expositors of the N. T. appeared to vie with each other in disregarding the exact import of compound verbs (cf. e.g. Seyffarth de indole ep. ad Hebr. p. 92). With a view to check such recklessness I have commenced a new inquiry into the subject: De verbor. c. praeposs. compositor. in N. T. usu, Lips. 1834 ff. 4to.; hitherto five articles have appeared. (As to Greek authors in general, cf. Cattier, Gazophylac. sec. 10, p. 60 sqq. ed. Abresch; C. F.
446 Hachenberg, de significat. praepositionum graec. in compositis. Traj. ad Rh. 1771. 8vo.)

379 2. Compound verbs in which the preposition retains its dis-
6th ed. tinctive force may have one or another of the three following constructions:

a. The preposition may be repeated before the noun, as Matt. vii. 23 *ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ*, Heb. iii. 16 *οἱ ἐξελθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*, see Born. Xen. conv. p. 219 and my second Progr. de verb. compp. p. 7 sqq.; or

b. Another preposition of substantially the same import may be used before the noun, as Matt. xiv. 19 *ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*, Mark xv. 46 *προσεκύλισε λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν*; or

c. The compound verb may, without the intervention of a preposition, directly govern a case such as its import requires, and such at the same time as the preposition also commonly governs; as, Mark iii. 10 *ἐπιπίπτειν αὐτῷ*, Luke xv. 2 *συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς*, etc. Accordingly, verbs compounded with *ἀπό*, *κατά* (*against*), *πρό*, take the Gen.; those compounded with *περί* (Matt. iv. 23 *περιάγειν τὴν Γαλιλαίαν*, Acts ix. 3), the Acc.

3. Which of these modes of construction is the regular one, must be learned from usage. Sometimes two of them, or all three together, occur (cf. ἐπιβάλλειν, likewise parallel passages such as Matt. xxvii. 60 and Mark xv. 46; Jno. ix. 6 and vs. 11; Acts xv. 20 and vs. 29).[1] Yet it must not be overlooked that even in this case usage has often established a distinction. Thus no one 398
will regard it as an indifferent matter whether verbs compounded 7th ed.
with εἰς be construed with a noun by the insertion of the preposition εἰς (πρός), or with a case alone without a preposition.[2] For instance, ἐκπίπτειν in its proper sense takes ἐκ; but when used figuratively (like spe excidere), it governs the Gen. (Gal. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Philostr. Apoll. 1, 36; yet see Diod. S. 17, 47).[3] So προσφέρειν τινί of persons means, offerre alicui (aliquid); but προσφέρειν ἐπὶ τὰς συναγωγάς *to bring before the synagogue* (author- 447
ities), Luke xii. 11.[4] Cf. also προσέρχεσθαί τινι *adire aliquem* and προσέρχ. πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν 1 Pet. ii. 4; ἐφιστάναι τινί (of persons) Acts iv. 1, and ἐφιστάναι ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν xi. 11. See, in general, my second Progr. de verb. compp. p. 10 sqq.

4. The usage of the N. T. is more particularly as follows:

1) After verbs compounded with ἀπό,

a) for the most part ἀπό is repeated (cf., in general, Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. p. 225): so after ἀπέρχεσθαι (followed by a personal noun) Mark i. 42; Luke i. 38; ii. 15; Rev. xviii. 14 (Lucian. 380
salt. 81), after ἀποπίπτειν Acts ix. 18 (in a material sense, cf. 6th ed.
Her. 3, 130; Polyb. 11, 21, 3; in a figurative sense it does not occur in the N. T.), ἀφιστάναι desistere a, or to withdraw from a person, Acts v. 38; Luke ii. 37; xiii. 27; 2 Cor. xii. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 5 etc. (Polyb. 1, 16, 3) but 1 Tim. iv. 1, see below, ἀπορφανίζεσθαι 1 Thess. ii. 17, ἀποσπᾶσθαι Luke xxii. 41; Acts xxi. 1 (Polyb. 1, 84, 1; Dion. H. judic. Thuc. 28, 5), after ἀφορίζειν Matt. xxv. 32, ἀποβαίνειν Luke v. 2 (Polyb. 23, 11. 4, etc.), ἀποχωρεῖν Matt. vii. 23; Luke ix. 39, ἀφαιρεῖσθαι Luke x. 42; xvi. 3 (Lucian. Tim. 45), ἀπαίρεσθαι Matt. ix. 15, ἀπαλλάττεσθαι Luke xii. 58;

[1] So ἀποστῆναι *deficere* with ἀπό in Xen. C. 5, 4, 1 and with the Gen. alone in 4, 5, 11.

[2] In prose εἰσιέναι or εἰσέρχεσθαι εἰς is usually employed in a *local* sense, e.g. εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; but with τινά or τινί (like incessere aliquem) in reference to desires, thoughts, etc. Demosth. Aristocr. 446 b.; Herod. 8, 8, 4, etc. Yet see *Valck.* Eurip. Phoen. 1099. As to εἰσέρχεσθαι in particular, see my second Progr. de verb. compp. p. 11 sq.

[3] In Greek authors ἀπέχεσθαι *obstinere* usually takes the Gen.; but in the N. T. it is sometimes followed by ἀπό, Acts xv. 20; 1 Thess. iv. 3; v. 22.

[4] Cf. πρὸς τοῖς ἱστοῖς τροχιλίαι προσήρτηντο Polyb. 8, 6, 5; 3, 46, 8, but (fig.) 9, 20, 5 προσαρτᾶν πολλά τινα τῇ στρατηγίᾳ.

Acts xix. 12, ἀποκρύπτειν Matt. xi. 25, ἀποστρέφειν Rom. xi. 26 Sept., once also after the figurative ἀποθνήσκειν Col. ii. 20 (cf. Porphyr. abstin. 1, 41), which elsewhere, in the composite sense of *dying to*, is construed with the Dat. (see immediately below).

b) after ἀπολαμβάνειν, παρά is used (with personal nouns), Luke vi. 34; cf. Diod. S. 13, 31; Lucian. pisc. 7 (ἀπό, when the verb signifies *to take away by force*, Polyb. 22, 26, 8).

c) the Genitive follows ἀποφεύγειν 2 Pet. i. 4 (but not in 2 Pet. ii. 20), ἀπαλλοτριοῦν Eph. ii. 12; iv. 18 (Polyb. 3, 77, 7), ἀφιστάναι (deficere a) 1 Tim. iv. 1 (Polyb. 2, 39, 7; 14, 12, 3), ἀποστερεῖσθαι (fig.) 1 Tim. vi. 5.

d) the Dat. is used after ἀποθνήσκειν *to die to a thing*, Gal. ii. 19; Rom. vi. 2, (in Rom. vi. 10 the Dat. is to be taken differently); similar is ἀπογίνεσθαι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις 1 Pet. ii. 24.

399 7th ed. 2) Verbs compounded with ἀνά in the *local* sense of *up* (to), are construed with,

a) εἰς, when the place to which the motion is directed is indicated, e.g. ἀναβαίνειν *to go* (travel) *up to* Luke xix. 28; Mark
448 x. 32 (Her. 9, 113), or *go up* (*upon* a mountain, *into* heaven etc.) Matt. v. 1; xiv. 23; Mark iii. 13 (Herod. 1, 12, 16; Plat. Alcib. 1, 117 b.; Dio C. 89, 97), ἀναβλέπειν Matt. xiv. 19 (Mark vii. 34; Luke ix. 16) Acts xxii. 13, ἀνάγειν Matt. iv. 1; Luke ii. 22; Acts xx. 3 (Herod. 7, 10, 15), ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι Mark xvi. 19, ἀναπίπτειν Luke xiv. 10, ἀναφέρειν Matt. xvii. 1; Luke xxiv. 51, ἀναχωρεῖν Matt. ii. 14; iv. 12 etc., ἀνέρχεσθαι Jno. vi. 3; Gal. i. 18.

b) πρός, principally when the point at which the motion terminates is a person; as, ἀναβαίνειν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα Jno. xx. 17, ἀνακάμπτειν Matt. ii. 12, ἀναπέμπειν Luke xxiii. 7 (ἀναβλέπ. πρός τινα Plat. Phaed. 116 d.; Arrian. Epict. 2, 16, 41), yet ἐπί τινα is also used in such cases Luke x. 6 (ἀνακάμπτειν cf. Diod. S. 3, 17), or the Dat. Luke xxiii. 11 ἀναπέμπειν τινί.

c) ἐπί, when the goal of the action is to be designated definitely as an eminence or as a surface on which the motion terminates, (Polyb. 8, 31, 1 ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγοράν (*up*) *to the market*, on the other hand ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν like the Latin ascendere Polyb. 10, 4, 6, ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ δικαστήριον frequently in Greek authors). Thus we find ἀναβιβάζειν ἐπὶ τὸν αἰγιαλόν Matt. xiii. 48 (Xen. C. 4, 2, 28; Polyb. 7, 17, 9), ἐπὶ τὸ κτῆνος Luke x. 34 (Palaeph. 1, 9; Xen. C. 4, 5, 16; cf. 7, 1, 38), ἀνακλίνεσθαι ἐπὶ τοὺς χόρτους Matt. xiv. 19, ἀναπίπτειν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν Matt. xv. 35 or ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς Mark viii. 6, ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα Luke v. 19, ἐπὶ

συκομορέαν xix. 4 (cf. Xen. C. 4, 1, 7; 6, 4, 4; Her. 4, 22; Plut. educ. 7, 13; Arrian. Epict. 3, 24, 33; Lys. 1; Alcib. 10; Paus. 6, 381
4, 6), *ἀναφέρειν ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον upon the wood* (cross) 1 Pet. ii. 24,[1] 6th ed.
ἀνακάμπτειν ἐπί Luke x. 6 (Plut. educ. 17, 13).

3) Verbs compounded with *ἀντί* (*against*) are regularly followed by the Dat., as Matt. vii. 2; Luke xiii. 17; Jno. xix. 12; Rom. xiii. 2 etc.; yet see Heb. xii. 4 *ἀνταγωνίζεσθαι πρός τι* (cf. vs. 3 *ἡ εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογία*), similar to which is *ἀντικεῖσθαι πρός* Polyb. 2, 66, 3; Dio C. p. 204 and 777.

4) Verbs compounded with *ἐκ* are sometimes followed by that preposition (i.e. when *out of* is to be expressed), and sometimes merely by *ἀπό* or *παρά* (i.e. when merely direction *from* or *from the vicinity of* is indicated): thus *ἐκβάλλειν ἐκ* Matt. xiii. 52; Jno. ii. 15; 3 Jno. 10, etc. (Plat. Gorg. 468 d.) and *ἀπό* Matt. vii. 4, *ἐκκλίνειν ἀπό* 1 Pet. iii. 11; Rom. xvi. 17, *ἐκκόπτειν ἐκ* Rom. xi. 24 (Diod. S. 16, 24), *ἐκπίπτειν ἐκ* Acts xii. 7 (Arrian. Ind. 30, 3), 449
ἐκλέγεσθαι ἐκ Jno. xv. 19 (Plat. legg. 7 p. 811 a.), *ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκ* Matt. xv. 11, 18; Rev. ix. 18 (Polyb. 6, 58, 4) and *ἀπό* Mark vii. 15 400
(var., not Matt. xxiv. 1) or *παρά* Jno. xv. 26, *ἐκφεύγειν ἐκ* Acts 7th ed.
xix. 16, *ἐξαίρειν* and *ἐξαιρεῖν ἐκ* 1 Cor. v. 2; Acts xxvi. 17, *ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ* Matt. ii. 6; Acts vii. 3 etc. (Her. 9, 12) or *παρά* Luke ii. 1. On the other hand these verbs are but rarely construed with the Genitive, never when used in a local sense except *ἐξέρχεσθαι* Matt. x. 14 (and even there not quite indubitably, see the variants; yet cf. *ἐκβαίνειν τινός* Jacobs, Philostr. p. 718); when used figuratively, however, the Gen. is constant with *ἐκπίπτειν* (like *spe excidere*) Gal. v. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 17; Plat. rep. 6, 496 c.; Lucian. contempl. 14 (yet with *ἐκ* Her. 3, 14; Dio C. p. 1054, 57), and *ἐκκρέμασθαι* Luke xix. 48. Lastly, *ἐκφεύγειν* even in a physical sense takes the Acc. (of the force): 2 Cor. xi. 33 *ἐκφεύγειν τὰς χεῖράς τινος* (Sus. 22), cf. Her. 6, 40 and frequently; *ἐκ* occurs after this verb merely to denote locality in Acts xix. 16 *ἐκφυγεῖν ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου*, cf. Sir. xxvii. 20.

5) The construction of verbs compounded with *ἐν* is very simple: when they signify direction *to* (towards) something, they are followed by *εἰς*; when they denote rest *in*, or *on*, a place, they are followed by *ἐν*, e.g. *ἐμβαίνειν εἰς* Matt. viii. 23; xiv. 22; Jno. vi. 17 (Her. 2, 29; Plat. Crat. 397 a.), *ἐμβάλλειν εἰς* Luke xii. 5 (Dio C. p. 288, 79; Plat. Tim. 91 c.; Lucian. Tim. 21), *ἐμβάπτειν εἰς* Mark xiv. 20 (but with *ἐν* Matt. xxvi. 23 *dip in the dish*),

[1] With the Acc. alone we find *ἀναβαίνειν ἵππον*, Dion. H. 2252, 7; Pausan. 10, 19, 6.

ἐμβλέπειν εἰς Matt. vi. 26; Acts i. 11, ἐμπίπτειν εἰς Luke x. 36 (Her. 7, 43; Plat. Tim. 84 c.; Lucian. Hermot. 59) 1 Tim. iii. 6, ἐμπτύειν εἰς Matt. xxvi. 67; xxvii. 30, but ἐνδημεῖν ἐν 2 Cor. v. 6, ἐνοικεῖν ἐν 2 Cor. vi. 16; Col. iii. 16 (with Acc. Her. 2, 178), ἐνεργεῖν ἐν Phil. ii. 13; Eph. i. 20 etc., ἐγγράφειν ἐν 2 Cor. iii. 2 (like ἐγγλύφειν ἐν Her. 2, 4), ἐμμένειν ἐν (τῇ διαθήκῃ) Heb. viii. 9. At the same time, in both significations the construction with the Dat. occurs not unfrequently, cf. ἐμβλέπειν τινί (of a person) Mark x. 21, 27; Luke xxii. 61; Jno. i. 36, 43 (Plat. rep. 10, 609 d.; Polyb. 15, 28, 3), ἐμπτύειν τινί Mark x. 34; xiv. 65; xv. 19, ἐμμένειν τινί (πίστει) Acts xiv. 22 (Xen. Mem. 4, 4, 4; Lycurg. 19, 4;
382 Lucian. Tim. 102). *Ἐντρυφᾶν to revel in something* is construed
6th ed. in Greek authors with the Dat. alone (e.g. Diod. S. 19, 71); on the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 13 ἐν is repeated. In Rom. xi. 24 ἐγκεντρίζειν is construed first with εἰς and then with the Dat.

6) Still more simple is the construction of verbs compounded with εἰς, such as εἰσάγειν, εἰσπορεύεσθαι, εἰσφέρειν, εἰσέρχεσθαι; viz.
450 they uniformly repeat εἰς, cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 210; yet see Hm. Eurip. Ion p. 98, and my second Progr. de Verb. compp. p. 13.

7) Of the verbs compounded with ἐπί, some are construed with that preposition (more rarely with εἰς), and some with the Dative alone; yet many take either construction indifferently: ἐπιβάλλειν εἰς (*into*) or ἐπί τι (*upon* Plat. Prot. 334 b.) Mark iv. 37; Luke v. 36; ix. 62, also with the Dat. of the person 1 Cor. vii. 35; Mark
401 xi. 7; Acts iv. 3 (Polyb. 3, 2, 8; 3, 5, 5),[1] ἐπιβαίνειν ἐπί or εἰς
7th ed. Acts xxi. 6; xx. 18 (Matt. xxi. 5), also with a local Dat. Acts xxvii. 2 (Polyb. 1, 5, 2; Diod. S. 16, 66), ἐπιβλέπειν ἐπί Luke i. 48; Jas. ii. 3; Plut. educ. 4, 9 (with εἰς Plat. Phaedr. 63 a.), ἐπικεῖσθαι ἐπί τινι Jno. xi. 38, also with the Dat. of the person 1 Cor. ix. 16, ἐπιπίπτειν ἐπί τι Luke i. 12; Acts x. 10, or ἐπί τινι Acts viii. 16, or with the Dat. of the person Mark iii. 10; Acts xx. 10 (Polyb. 1, 24, 4), ἐπιῤῥίπτειν ἐπί τι 1 Pet. v. 7, ἐπιτιθέναι ἐπί τι Mark iv. 21; Matt. xxiii. 4; Acts ix. 17 etc., or with the Dative, mostly of the person Luke xxiii. 26; Mark vii. 32; Acts ix. 12; 1 Tim. v. 22 etc., rarely of the thing Jno. xix. 2 (Lucian. Tim. 41, 122), ἐπέρχεσθαι ἐπί τι Luke i. 35; Acts viii. 24; xiii. 40 or with the Dative of the thing Luke xxi. 26, ἐπαίρειν ἐπί or εἴς τι Jno. xiii. 18; Luke xviii. 13, ἐποικοδομεῖν ἐπί τι 1 Cor. iii. 12 or

[1] On ἐπιβάλλειν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπί τινα and τινι (Lucian. Tim. 10) in particular, see *Fr.* Mr. p. 637. We find in a material sense in Polyaen. 5, 2, 12 ποίᾳ πόλει βούλοιτο ἐπιπλεῦσαι.

τινι Eph. ii. 20, but also ἐν Col. ii. 7, ἐπιδεῖν ἐπί τι Acts iv. 29, ἐπιφέρειν with the Dat. of the thing Phil. i. 17, ἐφικνεῖσθαι εἴς τινα 2 Cor. x. 14, ἐφάλλεσθαι ἐπί τινα Acts xix. 16 (1 Sam. x. 6; xi. 6). On the other hand, ἐπιγράφειν is construed with ἐν, 2 Cor. iii. 2 cf. Plat. de lucri cupid. p. 229 etc.; Palaeph. 47, 5 (differently in Num. xvii. 2; Prov. vii. 3). Ἐπεκτείνεσθαι Phil. iii. 14 (*stretch one's self out* after) and, when joined to names of persons, ἐπιφαίνειν and ἐπιφαύειν invariably take the Dative alone, Eph. v. 14; Luke i. 79 (cf. Gen. xxxv. 7); so also does ἐπιφέρειν in the sense of adding something to something, Phil. i. 17. Ἐπισκιάζειν has sometimes the Dative of the person, as in Acts v. 15 and probably in Mark ix. 7 (*to make a sheltering shade for one*, cf. Ps. xc. 4), and sometimes the Acc. Matt. xvii. 5; Luke ix. 34 (*overshadow, envelope*, as transitive). In the Sept. we find also ἐπισκιάζ. ἐπί τινα Ps. cxxxix. 8; Exod. xl. 29.

8) Of the verbs compounded with διά, there are but few in which the preposition is particularly prominent: cf. in the N. T. διαπορεύεσθαι διὰ σπορίμων Luke vi. 1, cf. D. S. exc. Vat. p. 30 (but we find also διαπορεύεσθαι πόλεις, yet in the sense of *obire*, 451
Acts xvi. 4), διέρχεσθαι διά Matt. xii. 43; 2 Cor. i. 16 *to pass through* (and consequently out of) something, cf. Strabo 8, 332, and the pregnant διασώζειν δι' ὕδατος 1 Pet. iii. 20. Most of them are construed like transitives, with the Acc., e.g. διαπλεῖν *sail* 383
through Acts xxvii. 5, likewise διέρχεσθαι when it signifies *pass* 6th ed.
through Luke xix. 1; Acts xv. 3, διαβαίνειν Heb. xi. 29 etc.

9) Verbs compounded with κατά which denote an action descending upon a local point, take ἀπό or ἐκ when the *terminus a quo* is to be expressed, e.g. καταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ Luke ix. 54; 1 Thess. iv. 16, καταβ. ἐκ τοῦ οὐρ. Jno. iii. 13; vi. 41; when the *terminus ad quem* is to be indicated (Dio C. 108, 23; 741, 96) they take ἐπί, εἰς, or πρός, according to the respective nature of the point in view, Luke xxii. 44; Mark xiii. 15; Acts xiv. 11, perhaps the Dative alone in Acts xx. 9 καταφέρεσθαι ὕπνῳ.[1] On the other hand, καθῆσθαι, καθίζειν, κατατιθέναι ἔν τινι signify 402
to set down on some place, etc. Κατηγορεῖν *to accuse*, in as far 7th ed.
as the notion of κατά is retained, is usually construed with the Gen. of the person; κατηγορεῖν τι κατά τινος occurs once, Luke xxiii. 14, and similarly ἐγκαλεῖν κατά τινος Rom. viii. 33; cf. Soph. Philoct. 328. Analogous to κατηγορεῖν with the Gen. is Rom.

[1] As we find elsewhere καταφέρεσθαι εἰς ὕπνον or ἐφ' ὕπνῳ, see *Kühnöl* in loc. Otherwise ὕπνῳ might also be taken as Ablative.

xi. 18 *κατακαυχᾶσθαί τινος boast against something* cf. Jas. ii. 13, and *καταμαρτυρεῖν τινος* Matt. xxvi. 62; xxvii. 13; but *κατακαυχ. κατά τινος* Jas. iii. 14.

10) Verbs compounded with *μετά* in which this preposition signifies *trans*, as *μεταβαίνειν*, *μεταμορφοῦν*, *μετασχηματίζειν*, *μετανοεῖν*, *μετοικίζειν* etc., naturally take *εἰς* to denote passing over *into*, cf. Vig. p. 639.

11) Verbs compounded with *παρά*, are followed by *ἀπό* or *παρά* (yet see § 47 pp. 365, 369 ff.) when the place *whence* is to be expressed, e.g. Acts i. 25 *ἀφ' ἧς* (*ἀποστολῆς*) *παρέβη* (Deut. xvii. 20; Josh. xi. 15, etc.), according to others *ἐξ ἧς* (Deut. ix. 12, 16); *παραλαμβάνειν ἀπό τινος* 1 Cor. xi. 23 and *παρά τ.* 1 Thess. iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 6, *παραφέρειν ἀπό τ.* Mark xiv. 36; Luke xxii. 42, *παρέρχεσθαι ἀπό τ.* Matt. v. 18; Mark xiv. 35.

12) Most verbs compounded with *περί* have become regular transitives, and accordingly govern the Acc.; as, *περιέρχεσθαι* 1 Tim. v. 13 (obire), *περιζωννύναι* Eph. vi. 14, *περιϊστάναι* Acts xxv. 7. In a material sense, with *περί* repeated, we find once
452 *περιαστράπτειν* Acts xxii. 6 (in the parallel passage Acts ix. 3 it is used as transitive), *περιζώννυσθαι* Rev. xv. 6 (*περὶ τὰ στήθη*), *περικεῖσθαι* Mark ix. 42; Luke xvii. 2 (*περισπᾶσθαι* Luke x. 40), but with Dat. *περιπίπτειν* (*λῃσταῖς*, *πειρασμοῖς*) Luke x. 30; Jas. i. 2 (Thuc. 2, 54; Polyb. 3, 53, 6; Lycurg. 19, 1) and *περικεῖσθαι* Heb. xii. 1.

13) Of verbs compounded with *πρό*, only *προπορεύεσθαι* Luke i. 76 repeats the preposition: *προπορεύσῃ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου* (Deut. ix. 3); in the Sept. *ἐνώπιον* is also used Ps. lxxxiv. 14; xcvi. 3 and *ἔμπροσθεν* Gen. xxxii. 16; Isaiah lviii. 8. So in Luke i. 17 *προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ* (but in xxii. 47 *προήρχετο αὐτούς*). Further, see above, No. 2.

14) Verbs compounded with *πρός* repeat that preposition when *towards* in a local sense is to be indicated, e.g. *προσπίπτειν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τινός* Mark vii. 25; cf. Dio C. 932, 82; 1275, 53 (but *προσπίπτειν τοῖς γόνασι* Diod. S. 17, 13), *προστίθεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς*
384 *πατέρας* Acts xiii. 36; also *προσκολλᾶσθαι πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα cleave* 8th ed. *to his wife* Mark x. 7; Eph. v. 31. On the other hand, with *ἐπί* in Matt. vi. 27 *προστιθέναι ἐπὶ τὴν ἡλικίαν*. More rarely the Dat. alone is used, e.g. *προσέρχ. ὄρει* Heb. xii. 22, *προσπίπτειν οἰκίᾳ* Matt. vii. 25 (Xen. eq. 7, 6; Philostr. Apol. v. 21), and of direction, *προσφωνεῖν τινι call to* Matt. xi. 16; Acts xxii. 2, cf. Diod. S. 4, 48 (but *προσφωνεῖν τινα call* one *hither* Luke vi. 13). On the other

hand, the Dat. alone is almost invariably used when the object ap- 403
proached is a person, e.g. προσπίπτειν τινί (to fall down before 7th ed.
one) Mark iii. 11; v. 33; Acts xvi. 29, προσφέρειν τινί (Philostr. Apol. v. 22), προσέρχεσθαί τινι *to draw near to one*, or when the approaching is itself to be taken *figuratively*, e.g. προσάγειν τῷ θεῷ *to bring to God* 1 Pet. iii. 18 (in Sept. προσάγειν τῷ κυρίῳ frequently), προσκλίνεσθαί τινι *to attach one's self to* Acts v. 36 cf. προσέχειν τινί Heb. vii. 13; Acts xvi. 14, προσεύχεσθαί τινι Matt. vi. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 13, προστιθέναι λόγον τινί Heb. xii. 19, προστίθεσθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ Acts ii. 41. If the verb implies rest (πρός τινι), it is construed either thus with the Dat. alone, as προσμένειν τινί Acts xi. 23; 1 Tim. v. 5, προσεδρεύειν 1 Cor. ix. 13 (Polyb. 8, 9, 11; 38, 5, 9), προσκαρτερεῖν Mark iii. 9; Col. iv. 2; Rom. xii. 12; cf. Polyb. 1, 55, 4; 1, 59, 12; Diod. S. 20, 48 etc., or (in strictly local relations) with ἐν, e.g. προσμένειν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ 1 Tim. i. 3.

15) Verbs compounded with σύν but rarely repeat that preposition Col. ii. 13 (συζωοποιεῖν), or take instead of it μετά (Weber, Demosth. 210) Matt. xxv. 19 (συναίρειν), 2 Cor. viii. 18 (συμπέμπειν), Matt. xx. 2 (συμφωνεῖν), xvii. 3 (συλλαλεῖν), Mark xiv. 54; 453
they are most frequently construed with the Dat. alone, instances of which occur on nearly every page of the N. T. (also in 1 Cor. xiii. 6; Jas. ii. 22, not in Rom. vii. 22). In classical Greek this construction is almost the only one used. Acts i. 26 συγκατεψηφίσθη μετὰ τῶν ἕνδεκα ἀποστόλων is a pregnant expression.

16) Of the verbs compounded with ὑπό none repeat the preposition; but when they denote direction *towards* (ὑπάγειν, ὑποστρέφειν etc.) they take εἰς or πρός, and when the ὑπό means *under*, as in ὑποπλεῖν, they are used as transitives.

17) Verbs compounded with ὑπέρ are for the most part used absolutely. Only ὑπερεντυγχάνειν repeats ὑπέρ Rom. viii. 26 (var.), cf. Judith v. 21; Sir. xxxvi. 27; and ὑπερφρονεῖν is construed with παρά in Rom. xii. 3. Ὑπερβαίνειν in 1 Thess. iv. 6 and ὑπεριδεῖν in Acts xvii. 30 are used transitively in a figurative sense.

Note. The N. T. contains no decided instance of the usage, not very rare in Greek authors, according to which the preposition of a compound verb influences also a second verb (Franke, Dem. p. 30).

§ 53. CONJUNCTIONS.

1. Conjunctions, particles designed to connect words and sentences, classify themselves according to the various species of

connection, which are the same in all cultivated languages and are
285 eight in number (Krü. 308); cf. O. Jahn, grammaticor. gr. de
6th ed. conjunctionibus doctrina Gryph. 1847.

The primitive conjunctions are monosyllabic: καί, τοι, τε, δέ, μέν,
104 οὖν. Many are obviously derived from pronouns or adjectives:
4th ed. ὅτε, ὅτι, ὡς, τοι, ἀλλά etc. Others are compound: ἐάν (εἰ ἄν), ἐπεί, ὥστε, γάρ (γε ἄρα), τοίνυν etc. Some are construed with a
454 particular mood according to their signification (εἰ, ἐάν, ἵνα, ὅπως, ὅτε etc.). See, in general, Hm. emend. p. 164 sqq.

The principal conjunctions (of all the various classes) used in Greek prose are employed in the N. T., and in their legitimate senses.[1] But τοι, μήν (by themselves) do not occur; many compounds also, the more refined niceties of expression (e.g. γοῦν), were unnecessary in the style of the N. T.

It is further to be specially remarked, that causal conjunctions (as ὅτι, ἐπεί, ἐπειδή) originally designated for the most part something present, either tangible or temporal; — a connection of ideas observable also in the case of prepositions (p. 360 sq.), and which occurs likewise in Latin and German (quod, quoniam, quando, quandoquidem, weil).

2. The most simple and most general connection of words and sentences, the mere coupling of contiguous words and sentences, is formed by καί and τε (*et* and *que*), the latter of which occurs oftenest in Luke, particularly in the Acts, and then in the Epistle to the Hebrews: Matt. ii. 13 παράλαβε τὸ παιδίον καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ φεῦγε εἰς Αἴγυπτον, Acts x. 22 ἀνὴρ φοβούμενος τ. θεόν, μαρτυρούμενός τε ὑπὸ ὅλου τοῦ ἔθνους, iv. 13 θεωροῦντες ... ἐθαύμαζον, ἐπεγίνωσκόν τε αὐτούς etc. The distinction between καί and τε is this: καί is *con*junctive (of something co-ordinate), τε is *ad*junctive (of something accessary). Says Hermann, καί conjungit, τε adjungit; with which cf. Klotz, Devar. II. 744.[2] Hence τε denotes rather an internal (logical) relation; καί, rather an external.

Observation shows that in the N. T. also τε[3] designates something

[1] *Schleiermacher*, Hermen. S. 66 goes too far; on S. 130 his opinion is more correct. It is only in reference to the position of certain conjunctions that the language of the N. T. departs from the earlier prose.

[2] Cf. the different views of philologists as to καί and τε (originating in τοι *Hm.* Soph. Trach. 1015) *Hm.* Vig. 835; ad Eurip. Med. p. 331; *Hand* de partic. τε, Jen. 1832. 2 Progr. 4to.; *Bhdy.* 482 f.; *Sommer* in the n. Jahrbüch. f. Philol. 1831. III. 400 f.; *Hartung*, Part. I. 58 ff.

[3] As to the Latin *que*, see *Zumpt*, Gr. § 333; *Hand*, Tursellin. II. 467 sq.; cf. *Bauermeister*, über die Copulativpartikeln im Latein. Luckau, 1853. 4to.

additional, supplementary, explanatory, flowing from what precedes, or even its details (Rost 722 f.), Jno. vi. 18; Acts ii. 33, 37; iv. 33; v. 42; vi. 7; viii. 13, 28, 31; x. 28, 48; xi. 21; xii. 6; xv. 4, 39; xix. 12; xx. 7; xxi. 18; Rom. xvi. 26; — hence usually something of inferior importance, Jno. iv. 42; Acts xvi. 34. Sometimes, however, τε has the effect to give 455
prominence: in Heb. ix. 1 εἶχε καὶ ἡ πρώτη (διαθήκη) δικαιώματα λατρείας τό τε ἅγιον κοσμικόν, the last particular is subjoined by τε as something specific and implied in δικ. λατρ.; but when the author in vs. 2 sqq. speaks 405
of the sanctuary in detail, he takes this specification as his leading idea. 7th ed.
There is nothing strange in this; for that which is not co-ordinate (καί) 386
with what precedes but is merely annexed to it, may just as well, accord- 6th ed.
ing to circumstances, be more important as less; cf., further, Heb. xii. 2. Indeed, it may be remarked generally (Klotz l. c.), that the private views of the writer often have much to do in deciding him to choose τε; and that τε and δέ were early interchanged in the N. T. by transcribers (Acts vii. 26; viii. 6; ix. 24; xi. 13; xii. 8, 12; xiii. 44; xxvi. 20, etc.).

3. In the N. T., as in the Biblical style generally, the simple connection by means of καί[1] is often chosen, even where in a more artificial diction some more specific conjunction would have been employed. This circumstance led the earlier biblical philologists to the erroneous assumption, that in the N. T. καί, like the Hebrew ו, was a sort of conjunction-general, combining in itself the significations of all conjunctions whatever, and of many adverbs besides (see still Schleusner's lexic. under the word).

But in the N. T., as in Greek authors (Klotz, Devar. II. 635), καί has only two significations: *and* and *also*.[2] These significations, however, comprehend several shades of meaning, which we express by special words: thus *also* is intensified into *even*, *vel*, *adeo* (Fr. Rom. I. 270; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 50). In many passages, however, this is not the case, but καί as a simple copula was chosen by the writer either in accordance with the simplicity of Biblico-Oriental thought, or designedly on rhetorical grounds; sometimes both causes concur. A translator should not efface the coloring of the style by employing more specific conjunctions.

[1] The *and* uniting separate clauses deserves perhaps special mention only in the case, often overlooked, where a writer tacks one O. T. quotation to another e.g. Acts i. 20 γενηθήτω ἡ ἔπαυλις ... ἐν αὐτῇ (Ps. lxix.), καὶ τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ... ἕτερος (Ps. cix.); Heb. i. 9 f. (see *Bleek*); Rom. ix. 33.

[2] *Klotz*, as above: In omnibus locis, ubicunque habetur καί particula, aut simpliciter copulat duas res, aut ita ponitur ut praeter alias res, quae aut re vera positae sunt aut facile cogitatione suppleri possunt, hanc vel illam rem esse aut fieri significet, et in priore caussa *und* reddi solet, in posteriore *etiam, quoque, vel*, sicuti res ac ratio in singulis locis requirit.

456 In the narrative style, especially of the first three Gospels, the several facts are usually strung together in simple succession by *καί*; whereas the use of *δέ* or *οὖν*, *μετὰ τοῦτο*, *εἶτα*, etc. instead would give more variety, and participial and relative constructions would distinguish with greater clearness principal from subordinate matters: Matt. i. 24 f. *παρέλαβεν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν αὐτὴν ἕως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν, καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν*, iv. 24 f.; vii. 25, 27; Luke v. 17, see § 60. The case in which a specification of time is given and then the event attached to it by *καί*, deserves particular attention; as, Mark xv. 25 *ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν* (a supplementary statement, as it were, to vs. 24) *it was the third hour and (when) they crucified him*; — where *ὅτε* was early
406 substituted as a correction. From this we must distinguish Luke xxiii. 44
7th ed. *ἦν ὡσεὶ ὥρα ἕκτη καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο*, where if *ὅτε* were used the time would
387 be brought out as the principal matter, and the event regarded as subor-
6th ed. dinate; both, however, are to be represented as co-ordinate, — hence *καί*. This structure of a sentence is found also in Greek authors (Mtth. 1481; Mdv. 214), e.g. Plat. symp. 220 c. *ἤδη ἦν μεσημβρία καὶ ἄνθρωποι ᾐσθάνοντο*, Arrian. Al. 6, 9, 8 *ἤδη πρὸς τῇ ἐπάλξει ἦν καὶ ... ὤθει*, Thuc. 1, 50; Xen. A. 1, 1, 8. Still more unlike is the case when, in prophetic announcements, the time is first specified and then a clause annexed with *καί*, — a construction which imparts greater solemnity to the discourse: Luke xix. 43; Heb. viii. 8; 1 Cor. xv. 52. In exhortations also, like *αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν*, Luke x. 28 *τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ*, the co-ordination of the two verbs is more forcible than such a construction as *τοῦτο ποιῶν ζήσῃ* (Franke, Demosth. p. 61). Cf. Demosth. olynth. 3, 11 c. *ὁρᾶτε ταῦθ' οὕτως ὅπως ... καὶ δυνήσεσθε ἐξιέναι καὶ μισθὸν ἕξετε*.

In such sentences as 1 Cor. v. 2 ... *and* ye are puffed up, Matt. iii. 14 I have need to be baptized by thee, *and* comest thou to me, Jno. vi. 70 have I not chosen you ...? *and* one of you is a traitor, xi. 8; xiv. 30; Heb. iii. 9, surprise or sorrow is more eloquently expressed by the simple *and* than by the more sonorous *however*, *nevertheless*, *notwithstanding*; in the mere contraposition of the clauses the contrast speaks as it were for itself. On the other hand, in Matt. xxvi. 53 *ἢ δοκεῖς, ὅτι οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι παρακαλέσαι τ. πατέρα μου καὶ παραστήσει μοι πλείω δώδεκα λεγεῶνας ἀγγέλων;* Heb. xii. 9 *οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τ. πνευμάτων καὶ ζήσομεν;* Jas. v. 18; Rev. xi. 3, that which was the object or aim of the first act, and might have been so represented (*ἵνα ...*), is by means of the consecutive *καί* raised to independence as a result, since the writer wished to
457 impart to it the greatest possible emphasis. A Greek author to produce such effect would probably have laid out the sentence from the outset as follows: *οὐ πολὺ μᾶλλον ὑποταγέντες τῷ πατρὶ ... ζήσομεν;* See, further, Rom. xi. 35; Mark i. 27; Matt. v. 15; cf. Ewald 653 (Sept. Ruth i. 11; Jonah i. 11). From later Greek may be quoted Malal. 2. p. 39 *ἐκέλευσε καὶ ἐκαύθη ἡ μυσερὰ κεφαλὴ τῆς Γοργόνος*.

As to the other uses of καί, inasmuch as they are referrible to the significations *and* and *also*, we have only to note:

a. Καί before interrogatives, Mark x. 26 καὶ τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; Luke x. 29; Jno. ix. 36; 1 Pet. iii. 13; 2 Cor. ii. 2 (familiar enough from the Greek authors, Plat. Theaet. 188 d.; Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 13; 6, 3, 22; Lucian. Herm. 84; Diog. L. 6, 93; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 30; the Latin *et*, too, is so used), comes under the signification *and*. We also say, *Und was that er? And what did he do?* — in an abrupt, hurried question, barring further discussion. On the other hand, καί never occurs in the N. T. before the Imperative to imply urgency (Hoogeveen, doctr. partic. I. 538 sqq.; Hartung I. 148). All the instances formerly alleged in support of this usage are of a different nature. In Matt. xxiii. 32 the καί is consecutive: ye profess to be sons etc., fill ye up then etc. In Luke xii. 29 καί denotes *also* or *and* (consequently). In Mark xi. 29 καί is *and;* in 1 Cor. xi. 6 *also*. The strengthening καί *after* interrogatives, as in Rom. viii. 24 ὃ γὰρ 407
βλέπει τις, τί καὶ ἐλπίζει; *why doth he yet hope for?* is reducible to the 7th ed.
sense of *also*.

b. Καί never occurs strictly as adversative. In the first place, passages in which καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή (Fr. Mr. p. 31), καὶ οὐδείς, etc. occurs — Matt. xi. 17; 388
xii. 39; xxvi. 60; Mark i. 22; vii. 24; ix. 18; Jno. iii. 11, 32; vii. 30 6th ed.
(on the contrary, vs. 44); x. 25; xiv. 30; Acts xii. 19; Col. ii. 8, etc. — must be set aside, as in these the contrast lies in the negation, and is neither strengthened by δέ nor weakened by a simple καί (Schaef. Dem. I. 645). Even in such sentences as Mark xii. 12 ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι κ. ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον, 1 Thess. ii. 18 ἠθελήσαμεν ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ... καὶ ἐνέκοψεν ἡμᾶς ὁ σατανᾶς, Jno. vii. 28; 1 Jno. v. 19, the writer probably viewed the two particulars as co-existing side by side, though we are more inclined to emphasize the opposition. And in Acts x. 28; Matt. xx. 10 (*the first supposed that they would receive more; and they also received every man a denarion*) we also employ *and* to give prominence to an unexpected result, see above. No one now will think it strange that in 1 Cor. xii. 4, 5, 6 δέ and καί are used alternately. Lastly, in 1 Cor. xvi. 9 two circumstances (one favorable and one unfavorable) detaining Paul in Ephesus are united; καί therefore is the simple copula.[1]

c. The epexegetical, more closely defining, καί *namely* (Hm. Philoct. 458
1408; Bremi, Demosth. p. 179; cf. Vc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 9; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 33 sq.; Weber, Demosth. p. 438) is primarily only *and* (*and indeed*), Jno. i. 16 *out of his fulness have we all received, namely* (that is) *grace for grace*, 1 Cor. iii. 5; xv. 38; Eph. vi. 18; Gal. vi. 16; Heb. xi. 17; Acts xxiii. 6. But this force has been attributed to καί in too many passages: in Matt. xiii. 41; xvii. 2; xxi. 5 καί is simply *and*.

[1] So early a scholar as *Hoogeveen* perceived that *but* (*however*) is not the proper meaning of καί: sciant non ex se sed ex oppositorum membror. natura hanc (notionem) nactam esse καί particulam (doctr. particul. I. 533).

In Mark xi. 28 the true reading [sustained also by Cod. Sin.] is probably ἤ. In Matt. iii. 5 to render καὶ ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου by *namely the country about the Jordan*, would be to join an incongruous adjunct to ἡ Ἰουδαία, as the two geographical notions do not exactly coincide nor is the former comprehended in the latter. The phraseology resembles, All Hesse and the Rhine-region; all Baden and Breisgau, cf. Krü. 318. In the expression θεὸς καὶ πατήρ the meaning of καί is simply *and* (at the same time), not *namely, that is*.

d. It may be doubted whether καί ever signifies *especially* (Bornem. Luc. 78; Fr. Mr. p. 11) when to a general term one that is special and strictly speaking already included in the former is added: in Mark i. 5 ἐξεπορεύετο πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμῖται πάντες, xvi. 7 the specification is made prominent by its very position, but καί simply signifies *and*. Cf. Heb. vi. 10. On the other hand, when a special term precedes, καί is sometimes put immediately before the general expression which includes the former, as in Matt. xxvi. 59 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι
408 καὶ τὸ συνέδριον ὅλον *and* (in one word, to sum up) *the whole sanhe-*
7th ed. *drim*, see Fr. Mt. 786; Mr. 652; cf. Vc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 67, Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 83 and rep. II. 212. Καί stands at the close of an entire exposition (before the final result) in Heb. iii. 19 (and according to some Codd. in 1 Cor. v. 13).

e. When καί signifies *also* (which is not the case e.g. in Eph. v. 2),[1] it
389 may be sometimes translated by *precisely, just, very* (eben, ja) (Hm. Vig.
8th ed. 837; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 419): Heb. vii. 26 τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεύς, ὅσως etc. for such a high priest just became us, vi. 7; 1 Pet. ii. 8 (Jno. viii. 25), Col. iii. 15; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 2 Tim. i. 12. Elsewhere it might be rendered by *vicissim* 1 Cor. i. 8; Phil. ii. 9; but *also* is quite sufficient.

f. When καί occurs in the consequent clause after a particle of time (ὅτε, ὡς), as in Luke ii. 21 ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτόν, καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, or vii. 12 ὡς ἤγγισε τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκώς, Acts i. 10; x. 17, the proper construction
459 would be: ἐπλήσθ. δὲ ἡμέραι . . . καὶ ἐκλήθη, ἤγγισε τῇ πύλῃ . . . καὶ ἐξεκομ. On the other hand, in Jno. i. 19 we must not (as even BCrus. does) join ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν . . . καὶ ὡμολόγησε, but ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν etc. is to be connected with αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία etc., see Lücke in loc. On καί commencing a parenthesis, e.g. Rom. i. 13 (Fr. in loc.), see § 62, 1. On καὶ γάρ see no. 8 p. 448; and on καὶ δέ, no. 7 p. 443. In Luke xix. 42 and Acts ii. 18 we find καί γε *et quidem*, and that without a word intervening, a usage that does not occur in the earlier written language. As to later authors, see Klotz, Devar. II. 318.

[1] As to καί *also* after relatives (Heb. i. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 23, etc.), see *Klotz*, Devar. II. 636; but, in general, *Krü.* 319. The exact meaning of the *also, even*, must always be gathered from the context. Καί is repeated several times in succession by way of climax in 1 Cor. xv. 1 f.

4. Connection in the form of *correlation* takes place, when two words or clauses are joined as corresponding to each other,[1] by means of *καί ... καί* (*τε ... τε* Acts xxvi. 16) or *τε ... καί*. The first formula (*καί ... καί*) is used when the writer from the very first conceives both members as co-ordinate, *et ... et* (*both ... and, as well ... as*); the latter, when he appends to the first member a second (*et ... que, not only ... but also*) Klotz, Devar. II. 740; Matt. x. 28 *ὁ δυνάμενος καὶ ψυχὴν κ. σῶμα ἀπολέσαι*, 1 Cor. x. 32 *ἀπρόσκοποι καὶ Ἰουδαίοις κ. Ἕλλησιν καὶ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, Phil. iii. 10; iv. 3; Acts xxi. 12 *παρεκαλοῦμεν ἡμεῖς τε καὶ οἱ ἐντόπιοι*, Luke ii. 16 *ἀνεῦρον τήν τε Μαριὰμ καὶ τ. Ἰωσὴφ καὶ τὸ βρέφος* etc., Krü. 327. In the former case, the members are combined as into one whole (or compact group); in the latter, the second member is to be viewed as something added to the first, while the respective importance of each is not thereby pronounced upon (Rost 134, 5 c.); cf. Acts iv. 27; v. 24; Rom. i. 14; Heb. xi. 32 etc. In the course of lengthened enumerations, groups (pairs) are thus formed by 409
τε ... καί (*... καί*), as in Heb. xi. 32 *Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψὼν κ.* 7th ed.
Ἰεφθάε, Δαυίδ τε κ. Σαμουὴλ κ. τῶν προφητῶν, 1 Cor. i. 30; Heb. vi. 2; Acts ii. 9, 10; Phil. i. 7.

Καὶ ... *καί* connect not merely things similar but also things contrasted, as in Jno. vi. 36 *καὶ ἑωράκατέ με καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε* the seeing and the not believing both occur, in xv. 24, probably also in xvii. 25. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. vii. 38 the co-ordination of the contraries is disturbed in the second member by a comparison. On the correspondence between *τε* and *δέ*, according to which the latter particle denotes, along with connection, some opposition (lenis oppositio Klotz, Devar. II. 741) as in Acts 390
xxii. 28 *and the chief captain answered ... but Paul said*, xix. 3, see Stallb. 6th ed.
Plat. Phileb. p. 36, and rep. II. 350; Hm. Eur. Med. p. 362 sq.; Klotz l.c. Τε and *καί* are placed either immediately together between the two 460
words thus formed into a group, as in Luke xxi. 11 *φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεῖα*; Acts ix. 18, or are separated by one or two of the connected words, as in Luke xxiii. 12 *ὅ τε Πιλᾶτ. καὶ ὁ Ἡρῴδης*, Jno. ii. 15; Acts ii. 43 *πολλά τε τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα*, x. 39 *ἔν τε τῇ χώρᾳ τ. Ἰουδαίων καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ*, Rom. i. 20; Acts xxviii. 23 etc., in which case the article, preposition, or adjective serves also for the second member. Otherwise in Phil. i. 7 *ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ* etc. (In Acts xix. 27; xxi. 28 we find *τε καί* in one and the same clause, *que etiam*, a combination rare in Greek authors, though not to be rejected.)

[1] Such passages as Mark ii. 26 *καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν*, Jno. v. 27, where *καί ... καί* are not parallel to each other but the second signifies *also*, do not come under this head, cf. Soph. Philoct. 274.

5. Correlation is brought out with greatest precision in the form of *comparison*: ὡς (ὥσπερ, καθώς) ... οὕτως; frequently καί is subjoined to the latter to increase its force, as in Jas. ii. 26 ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστιν, οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστιν, Jno. v. 21; Rom. v. 18, 21; 1 Cor. xv. 22; 2 Cor. i. 7; Eph. v. 24; Heb. v. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 12. Sometimes, in fact, καί in the second member actually takes the place of the comparative particle, as in Matt. vi. 10 γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς, Jno. vi. 57; x. 15; xiii. 33; xvii. 18; Acts vii. 51; see Bornem. Luke 71.

The popular style likes to introduce καί elsewhere into comparisons, though *also* is already implied in the comparative particle; as, 1 Cor. vii. 7 θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν, Luke xi. 1; Acts vii. 51; xv. 8; xxvi. 29. Accordingly καί is repeated in both members in Rom. i. 13 ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν, Matt. xviii. 33; Col. iii. 13; Rom. xi. 30 (var.), Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 372; Klotz, Devar. II. 635; Fr. Rom. I. 39; II. 538 sq.

6. *Disjunction* comes next under consideration. Simple disjunction is effected by ἤ (which is often repeated, especially in impassioned discourse, Rom. viii. 35) and by ἤ καί *or even* (Matt. vii. 10; Luke xviii. 11; Rom. ii. 15; xiv. 10; 1 Cor. xvi. 6; cf. Fr. Rom. I. 122).[1] Correlative disjunction, on the other hand, is expressed by ἤ ... ἤ, εἴτε ... εἴτε, *sive ... sive*, whether single
410 words or entire clauses are contrasted, Matt. vi. 24; 1 Cor. xiv. 6
7th ed. (ἤτοι ... ἤ Rom. vi. 16), Rom. xii. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 15, etc.

In the N. T. ἤ is never put for καί, nor καί for ἤ, Marle, floril. 124, 195;
461 cf. Schaef. Demosth. IV. 33.[2] There are cases, however, in which both
391 particles, each agreeably to its import, may be used with equal correctness
6th ed. (Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 146), e.g. 1 Cor. xiii. 1 and 2 Cor. xiii. 1 (cf. Matt. xviii. 16), also Heraclid. as quoted by Marle.[3] When *dissimilia* are joined together by καί (Col. iii. 11), they are merely placed in connection as individual objects, and not exhibited expressly as different or opposite.

[1] According to the nature of the thoughts, the second clause, annexed by means of ἤ καί, is either to be considered as supplementary (*Bengel* on Rom. ii. 15) and is of less importance than the first, or καί involves an enhancement as in 1 Cor. (*Klotz*, Devar. II. 592).

[2] As to *aut* for *et*, see *Hand*, Tursell. I. 540. On the other hand, disjunction by ἤ may in a manner include union by καί. When we say: Whoever murders father *or* mother is guilty of the most heinous crime, we mean of course at the same time that whoever murders both his parents is not less guilty. The *minus* includes the *majus*.

[3] On καί ... καί *vel ... vel*, see *Schoem.* Isae. p. 307.

In Matt. vii. 10 by καὶ ἐάν a second case is introduced to which the speaker proceeds (*further*); but the better reading [supported too by Cod. Sin.] is probably ἢ καί. In Luke xii. 2 we must supply καὶ οὐδὲν κρυπτόν. In Matt. xii. 27 Schott has correctly rendered καί by *porro*. In a sentence constructed like Matt. xii. 37 *or* would be quite inappropriate; no less so in Rom. xiv. 7. It has been urged by Protestants, on controversial grounds, that ἤ is used for καί in 1 Cor. xi. 27 ὃς ἂν ἐσθίῃ τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον ἢ πίνῃ τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου. But, not to mention that in this passage several good Codd. give καί (as in vss. 26, 28, 29), ἤ may be explained from the mode then current of partaking of the Lord's Supper, without giving countenance to the Catholic dogma of the communion in one kind, see Bengel and Baumgart. in loc.[1] Should any one insist, however, that ἤ proves a real distinction in the administration of the sacrament, even more would follow (looking at the matter philologically) than the Catholic interpreters could consent to take, viz. that the *cup* alone might be sufficient in the communion. In Acts i. 7 (x. 14); xi. 8; xvii. 29; xxiv. 12; Rom. iv. 13; ix. 11; Eph. v. 3 ἤ is employed in *negative* clauses (Thuc. 1, 122; Aelian. anim. 16, 39; Sext. Empir. hypot. 1, 69; Fr. Rom. III. 191 sq.; Jacobs, Philostr. imag. p. 374 and Aelian. anim. p. 457), where in Latin also *aut* is used for *et* (Cic. Tusc. 5, 17; Catil. 1, 6, 15; Tac. Annal. 3, 54 etc.; Hand, Turs. I. 534), and in οὐχ ὑμῶν ἐστιν γνῶναι χρόνους ἢ καιρούς the negation applies equally to γνῶναι χρόνους and γνῶναι καιρούς (the attention may be directed to the one *or* the other), so that the sense is exactly equivalent to γν. χρόν. καὶ καιρούς. When, lastly, καί and ἤ occur in parallel passages (Matt. xxi. 23; Luke xx. 2), the relation was differently 411
conceived by the different writers. It would be a manifest abuse of 7th ed.
parallelism to attempt to prove from this that the two particles are synonymous. Besides, these two particles have been not unfrequently interchanged by transcribers (Jno. viii. 14; Acts x. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 etc.; 462
Maetzner, Antiph. p. 97). Cf. also Fr. Mr. 275 sq.; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 11; whereas Tholuck, Bergpred. S. 132 f., reaches no very clear result.

7. *Antithesis* is expressed sometimes by the simple adversatives (δέ, ἀλλά), sometimes by a concessive construction (μέντοι, ὅμως, ἀλλά γε). A mutual relation of contrast, and consequently a combination of antithetical clauses, was originally indicated by μὲν ... δέ (1 Pet. iii. 18; iv. 6); but this relation was ultimately weakened into mere correspondence (Rom. viii. 17; 1 Cor. i. 23), and 392
became logically even inferior to parallelism by means of καί ... 6th ed.
καί (Hartung II. 403 ff.).

The particles ἀλλά and δέ differ in general like *sed* and *autem* (*vero*), see

[1] Even according to our mode of communing it is conceivable that one may receive the bread devoutly, but the cup with sensuous (perhaps sinful) distraction. Accordingly we, too, could say, Whoever receiveth bread *or* cup unworthily.

Hand, Tursellin. I. 559, cf. 425 : The former (the Neut. Plur. of ἄλλος with a different accent, Klotz, Devar. II. 1 sq.), which may often be translated by *yet, nevertheless, imo*, expresses proper and strict opposition (cancelling a previous statement or indicating that it is to be disregarded) ; the latter (weakened from δή Klotz, l. c. p. 355) connects while it contrasts, i.e. adds another particular different from what precedes (Schneider, Vorles. I. 220). When a negation precedes, we find οὐκ ... ἀλλά *not ... but*, and also οὐ (μή) ... δέ *not ... but* (*but rather*), e.g. Acts xii. 9, 14; Heb. iv. 13; vi. 12; Jas. v. 12; Rom. iii. 4, οὔπω ... δέ Heb. ii. 8 (Thuc. 4, 86; Xen. C. 4, 3, 13; cf. Hartung, Partik. I. 171; Klotz, Devar. II. 360). On ἀλλά and δέ we remark specially that,

a) ἀλλά is used when a train of thought is broken off or interrupted, whether by an objection (Rom. x. 19; 1 Cor. xv. 35; Jno. vii. 27; Klotz, Devar. II. 11; cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 2, 9; 4, 2, 16; Cyr. 1, 6, 9), or by a correction (Mark xiv. 36; 2 Cor. xi. 1), or by a question (Heb. iii. 16; cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 11; Klotz II. 13), or by an encouragement, command, request (Acts x. 20; xxvi. 16; Matt. ix. 18; Mark ix. 22; Luke vii. 7; Jno. xii. 27; cf. Xen. C. 1, 5, 13; 2, 2, 4; 5, 5, 24; Arrian. Al. 5, 26, 3; see Palairet p. 298; Krebs p. 208; Klotz, Devar. II. 5); for in all these instances something different is advanced subversive of what precedes. Cf. also Jno. viii. 26 and Lücke in loc. In a *consequent* clause (after conditional particles) ἀλλά, like the Latin *at*, gives it an adversative emphasis, and so strengthens it: 1 Cor. iv. 15 ἐὰν μυρίους παιδαγωγοὺς ἔχητε ἐν Χριστῷ, ἀλλ' οὐ πολλοὺς πατέρας (*yet not, still*), 2 Cor. iv. 16; xi. 6; xiii. 4; Col. ii. 5 (cf. Her. 4, 120; Xen. C. 8, 6, 18; Lucian. pisc. 24; Aelian. anim. 11, 31; see Kypke II. 197; Niebuhr ind. ad Agath. p. 409; Klotz, Devar. II. 93). (The case is different in Rom. vi. 5 εἰ σύμφυτοι
412 γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα
7th ed. ... surely *we shall be also* etc., see Fr. in loc.) The use of ἀλλά, when
463 after a negative question it absorbs the answer *no*, as in Matt. xi. 8 τί ἐξήλθατε θεάσασθαι; κάλαμον ὑπὸ ἀνέμου σαλευόμενον; ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; and 1 Cor. vi. 6; x. 20; Jno. vii. 48 sq., requires no explanation (see Schweigh. Arrian. Epict. II. II. 839; Raphel. ad 1 Cor. as above). In Phil. iii. 8 ἀλλὰ μὲν οὖν signifies *at sane quidem;* ἀλλά opposing the Pres. ἡγοῦμαι as a correction to the Perf. ἥγημαι.[1] In Rom. v. 14, 15 ἀλλά occurs
2:3 twice in succession, in different relations; in 1 Cor. vi. 11 it is repeated
6th ed. several times, emphatically, in one and the same relation.

[1] Ἀλλ' ἤ after a direct or indirect negation, which occurs (occasionally in the Sept. e.g. Job vi. 5 and) three times in the N. T. (Luke xii. 51; 2 Cor. i. 13 and 1 Cor. iii. 5,— but in the last passage is probably spurious), must according to the careful investigation of *Klotz*, Devar. p. 31 sqq., who followed *Krüger* (de formulae ἀλλ' ἤ et affinium particular. post negation. vel negat. sententias usurpatar. natura et usu. Brunsvic. 1834. 4to.), be referred to ἄλλο and not to ἀλλά. (In Luke as above *I am not come on earth to bring — aught but division.*) It is no valid objection to this exposition, that in 2 Cor., as above, ἀλλά itself precedes, cf. Plat. Phaed. 81 b.; see *Klotz* p. 36.

b) δέ is frequently employed when merely something new is subjoined, something other and *different* from what precedes, though not strictly something contrasted (Herm. Vig. 845); this occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 15 sq.; 1 Cor. iv. 7; xv. 35 even in a succession of questions (Hartung I. 169; Klotz, Devar. II. 356). Hence, in the first three Gospels καί and δέ are sometimes found respectively in parallel passages; in 2 Cor., however, as above, a clause commencing with ἤ is inserted in a series of clauses containing δέ.[1] Like the German *aber*, δέ is used in particular where an explanation is annexed, — whether as an integral part of a sentence, as in 1 Cor. ii. 6 σοφίαν λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, iii. 15; Rom. iii. 22; ix. 30; Phil. ii. 8, or as a complete sentence in itself, as in Jno. vi. 10; ix. 14; xi. 5; xxi. 1; Gal. ii. 2; Eph. v. 32; Jas. i. 6 — and where, after a parenthesis or digression, the train of thought is resumed (Hm. Vig. 846 sq.; Klotz II. 376; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 141 sq.); 2 Cor. x. 2; ii. 12; v. 8; Eph. ii. 4; cf. Plat. Phaed. p. 80 d.; Xen. An. 7, 2, 18; Paus. 3, 14, 1 (*autem* Cic. off. 1, 43; Liv. 6, 1, 10). In an explanation which is at the same time a correction, such as 1 Cor. i. 16, the adversative force of the particle is still perceptible. Sometimes δέ introduces a climax, as in Heb. xii. 6, or indicates successive steps in the discourse, as in 2 Pet. i. 5–7. As to δέ in the apodosis [Acts xi. 17], see Weber, Demosth. p. 387, particularly after participles (supplying the place of the protasis) as in Col. i. 21 (Klotz II. 374), see Jacobs, Aelian. anim. I. 26 praef. Δέ used several times in succession in didactic discourse must be interpreted according to the requirements of each particular case, as in 1 Pet. iii. 14 sqq. (the third δέ, however, is dropped by Lchm.) see Wiesinger. In narration often several clauses are connected together simply by δέ, as in Acts viii. 1–3, 7–9.

καί ... δέ (in one and the same clause), as often in the best authors (Weber, Demosth. p. 220), is equivalent to *et ... vero, atque etiam, and also* (Krü. 7th ed. 319 "καί means *also*; δέ, *and*"; Hartung I. 187 f. maintains the reverse), 413, 464 Matt. xvi. 18; Heb. ix. 21; Jno. vi. 51; xv. 27; 1 Jno. i. 3; Acts xxii. 29; 2 Pet. i. 5; Schaef. Long. p. 349 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 154; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 137. The opposite phrase δὲ καί (2 Pet. ii. 1) means *but also*.

As to μέν (weakened from μήν[2]), there is nothing peculiar in N. T. usage, for μέν ... δέ ... δέ in Jude 8 (not in 2 Cor. viii. 17) requires no explanation. Where, however, μέν ... ἀλλά correspond, as in Rom. xiv. 20 etc. (cf. Iliad 1, 22 sqq.; Xen. C. 7, 1, 16), the second clause is made more strongly prominent, Klotz, Devar. II. 3. Further, when μέν ... καί correspond, as in Acts xxvii. 21 f., there exists an unmistakable anacoluthon, Hm. Vig. 841; Maetzner, Antiph. 257. As to μέν without δέ following, see § 63, I. 2, e. p. 575. Finally, on the unauthorized insertion of μέν before δέ (Wahl, Clav. p. 307), see Fr. Rom. II. 423, cf. Rost 731.

[1] In Greek authors, also, δέ occurs frequently, as is well known, in narration.

[2] This occurs in the N. T. only in the pure Greek combination ἤ μήν Heb. vi. 14 (and even there not without var.), used to introduce an oath (*Hartung*, II. 376, 388).

Antithesis expressed by means of *yet, however*, is of very rare occurrence in the N. T. John uses μέντοι most frequently where others would have employed a simple δέ. He once strengthens μέντοι by prefixing ὅμως (xii. 42). Elsewhere ὅμως is used but twice, — by Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 7; Gal. iii. 15. We find καίτοιγε in Acts xiv. 17, referring to something that
394 precedes, and meaning *although, quamquam* [cf. also Jno. iv. 2]. In the
6th ed. N. T. there is nothing peculiar in the use of ἀλλά γε (Luke xxiv. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 2 etc.) *but yet, yet certainly*, Klotz, Devar. II. 24 sq., except that both particles are placed in immediate succession, which could scarcely occur in classic authors, Klotz, as above, p. 15. The correlation *though ... yet*, is expressed by εἰ καί ... ἀλλά in Col. ii. 5 εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῇ σαρκὶ ἄπειμι, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι σὺν ὑμῖν εἰμί, and by εἰ καί ... γε in Luke xviii. 4. In general, εἰ καί means *if also, si etiam, quamquam* (designating something as matter of fact); but καὶ εἰ *even if, etiam si* (putting something merely as a case supposed), cf. Hm. Vig. 832; Klotz, Devar. II. 519 sq.

8. The *temporal* relation of clauses is expressed by ὡς, ὅτε (ὅταν), ἐπεί, or by ἕως, μέχρι, πρίν (§ 41 **b.** 3, p. 296 sq. and § 60). An *inference* is indicated by οὖν, τοίνυν, ὥστε (μενοῦν), and more sharply by ἄρα, διό (ὅθεν), τοιγαροῦν, (οὐκοῦν only in Jno. xviii. 37). The *causal* relation is denoted by ὅτι, γάρ (διότι, ἐπεί), while ὡς, καθώς, καθότι (subjoining a clause) are rather explanatory than argumentative. Lastly, a *condition* is expressed by εἰ (εἴγε, εἴπερ), ἐάν, § 41 **b.** 2, p. 291 sq.

a. The most usual and most strictly syllogistic of the illative particles is οὖν, [Val. Chr. Fr. Rost üb. Ableitung, Bedeutung u. Gebrauch der
414 Partikel οὖν. Gött. 1859. 4to.]. Its reference can be discovered with more
7th ed. or less facility from the context in each instance, e.g. Matt. iii. 8, 10;
465 xii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 11 (see Mey. in loc.); Matt. xxvii. 22; Acts i. 21; Rom. vi. 4. But like the German *nun* (Eng. *then, now*), it is very often used to indicate the mere continuance of a narration (when what follows depends upon what precedes chronologically merely), Jno. iv. 5, 28; xiii. 6; cf. Schaef. Plutarch. IV. 425. Moreover, like the German *also* (*therefore, thus*) or *nun* (*now*), it is used especially after a digression to resume the train of thought (Heind. Plat. Lys. p. 52; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 285; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 42; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 413; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 738) 1 Cor. viii. 4; xi. 20, or when a writer proceeds to explain, (even by examples) as in Rom. xii. 20. Ἄρα *accordingly, quae cum ita sint, rebus ita comparatis*, serves, no doubt, primarily to introduce leviorem conclusionem, as it is used principally in conversation and the language of ordinary intercourse (Klotz, Devar. II. 167, 717); but in later Greek the use of this particle was extended, and individual writers, at least, employ it to indicate even a strictly logical inference. It inclines towards

its primary import when used in the apodosis (after a conditional clause) (Matt. xii. 28; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. iii. 29; Heb. xii. 8; cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 2; 8, 4, 7); so also when it expresses an inference from another man's averment (cf. 1 Cor. v. 10; xv. 15, where it may be rendered by *indeed, that is,* Klotz 169; cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 92; Hoogeveen, doctrina particul. I. 109 sq.) or proceeding (Luke xi. 48). In the N. T. Paul employs this particle most frequently, especially when analyzing the import of a quotation from the O. T., Rom. x. 17; Gal. iii. 7 (cf. Heb. iv. 9), or summing up a discussion, Rom. viii. 1 (Gal. iv. 31 var.); though in these cases he as often uses οὖν. In questions ἄρα refers either to an assertion or fact previously mentioned, Matt. xix. 25; Luke viii. 25; xxii. 23; Acts xii. 18; 2 Cor. i. 17, or to some thought existing in the mind of the questioner Matt. xviii. 1, and which suggests itself more or less distinctly to the 395
reader. It then signifies, *such being the case, under these circumstances,* 6th ed.
rebus ita comparatis, and sometimes, *of course, obviously,* Klotz II. 176. Likewise εἰ ἄρα *si forte* Mark xi. 13; Acts viii. 22 and ἐπεὶ ἄρα 1 Cor. vii. 14 may be referred to this signification (Klotz, as above, 178). Ἄρα οὖν combined, and that as the first words of a sentence (see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 823), *so then,* hinc ergo (where ἄρα is illative and οὖν continuative, cf. Hoogeveen, doctr. part. I. 129 sq.; II. 1002), is a favorite expression of Paul's, Rom. v. 18; vii. 3; viii. 12; ix. 16, etc. I know of no instances of this combination in Greek authors: in Plat. rep. 5, p. 462 a. the recent texts read (in the question) ἆρ' οὖν, cf. Schneider in loc.; Klotz, Devar. II. 180. Paul and Luke employ διό (δι' ὅ) most frequently. Τοίνυν *assuredly now, therefore,* and τοιγαροῦν (strengthened τοιγάρ, Klotz II. 738) *wherefore then,* are rare. As to ὥστε and its construction, see p. 301.

b. Ὅτι refers in general to some matter of fact under consideration, and hence signifies both *that* and *because,* quod; in the latter case, it is some- 466
times rendered still more forcible by a preceding διὰ τοῦτο (propterea quod). 415
Occasionally it is used elliptically, Luke xi. 18 *if Satan also is divided* 7th ed.
against himself, how will his kingdom stand? (I ask this) *because ye say, by Beelzebub* etc.; i. 25; Mark iii. 30 (Acta Apocr. p. 57); Bornem. Luc. p. 6. Likewise in Jno. ii. 18, where it amounts to the same thing to translate it *in consideration of the fact that* (*seeing that*), Fr. Mt. p. 248 sq. But in Matt. v. 45 ὅτι simply means *because.* (Sometimes it seems doubtful whether ὅτι means *because* or *that;* the decision then rests on hermeneutical grounds.) The compound διότι (chiefly found in later Greek) *for this reason that,* or simply *because,* Fr. Rom. I. 57 sq., is used most frequently by Paul and Luke.

Γάρ is in cultivated prose the most common causal particle, and corresponds to our *for.* Originally (it is contracted from γε and ἄρα, ἄρ), it expresses in general a corroboration or assent (γε) in reference to what precedes (ἄρα!) (see Hartung I. 457 ff.; Schneider, Vorles. I. 219; Klotz,

Devar. II. 232 f.[1]): *sane igitur, certe igitur, sane pro rebus comparatis* (*enim* in its primary import), and from this fundamental signification arose its causal force. In consequence of its original signification γάρ serves — passing over what is familiar — first of all and very naturally

a) to introduce explanatory clauses, whether they appear in the form of supplementary statements (sometimes of digressions) Mark v. 42; xvi. 4; 1 Cor. xvi. 5; Rom. vii. 1, or blend with the current of the discourse 2 Cor. iv. 11; Rom. vii. 2; Jas. i. 24; ii. 2; Heb. ix. 2; Gal. ii. 12. Γάρ is then to be rendered by *that is*, Klotz 234 sq. Explanatory in a wide sense every confirmation or proof (even Heb. ii. 8) may be said to be which we introduce by *for* (though the German *ja* comes nearer than *denn* to the primary import of γάρ Hartung I. 463 ff.): Matt. ii. 20 *go into the land of Israel; for they are dead* etc. This is especially the case in those passages where it was supposed that something is to be supplied before γάρ *for*,[2]
396 Matt. ii. 2: where is the born king of the Jews? (he that is born king of
6th ed. the Jews?) for we have seen his star, xxii. 28; 1 Cor. iv. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 5; Phil. iii. 20; 1 Pet. iv. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 5. Hence what Klotz says p. 240 is in point: Nihil supplendum est ante enuntiationem eam, quae infertur per partic. γάρ, sed ut omnis constet oratio, *postea demum* aliquid tacita cogitatione adsumendum erit, sed nihil tamen alieni, verum id ipsum, quod ea sententia quae praecedit γάρ particulae enuntiavit (for we have seen his star, — he must have been born, therefore, somewhere). Likewise,

467 b) in replies and rejoinders (Klotz p. 240 sq.) the original import of
416 γάρ is prominent; for in Jno. ix. 30 ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν etc. the
7th ed. reply refers primarily to the statement of the Pharisees in vs. 29 (ἄρα), and then subjoins an affirmation (γε): sane quidem mirum est etc. *in this at least, it is assuredly wonderful.* So also in 1 Cor. viii. 11; ix. 9, 10; xiv. 9; 1 Thess. ii. 20, in all which cases nothing is to be supplied before γάρ.[3] Equally unnecessary is it to supply anything in *exhortations* (Klotz 242) Jas. i. 7: *for* let not that man think etc.; here ἄρα refers back to ὁ γὰρ διακρινόμενος etc., and γε combines a corroboration with the inference. On the other hand,

[1] Si sequimur originem ipsam ac naturam particulae γάρ, hoc dicitur conjunctis istis particulis: *Sane pro rebus comparatis*, ac primum adfirmatur res pro potestate particulae γε, deinde refertur eadem ad antecedentia per vim particulae ἄρα.

[2] This practice of supplying something has been carried to an extent quite pedantic, e.g. Matt. iv. 18; xxvi. 11; Mark iv. 25; v. 42; 2 Cor. ix. 7. If it were maintained that between the propositions, "He makes clothes, for he is a tailor," we must supply, "One need not wonder at this," every body would regard it as ridiculous. As to the Latin *nam*, see *Hand*, Tursell. IV. 12 sqq.

[3] In Acts xvi. 37 Παῦλος ἔφη· δείραντες ἡμᾶς δημοσίᾳ ἀκατακρίτους, ἀνθρώπους Ῥωμαίους ὑπάρχοντας ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακήν, καὶ νῦν λάθρᾳ ἡμᾶς ἐκβάλλουσιν; Paul immediately answers the question himself, οὐ γάρ, ἀλλὰ . . . αὐτοὶ ἡμᾶς ἐξαγαγέτωσαν: non sane pro rebus comparatis. The ἄρα contained in γάρ glances back at the circumstances previously described; while the γε founds upon them a corroboration: continet (as Klotz says p. 242) cum adfirmatione conclusionem, quae ex rebus ita comparatis facienda sit.

c) in *questions* γάρ seems to deviate farthest from its original import. And in fact the origin of this use may have been afterwards forgotten, and γάρ have been regarded as the sign of a question[1] urgent because justified by the connection (Klotz 247). However, the essentially inferential force of γάρ (ἄρα!) is still perceptible in many passages: igitur rebus ita comparatis, adeo. In Matt. xxvii. 23 Pilate's question τί γὰρ κακὸν ἐποίησεν; refers to the demand of the Jews σταυρωθήτω in vs. 22. From this Pilate infers the opinion which he in the question imputes to the Jews: quid igitur (since you demand his crucifixion) putatis eum mali fecisse? So in Jno. vii. 41 (surely you do not think then that the Messiah comes out of Galilee? num igitur putatis, Messiam etc.?) The reference of this γάρ to something preceding is in all cases plain; — even in Acts xix. 35; viii. 31. It is usual in this case also to supply something before the question, even though only a *nescio* or *miror*, Hm. Vig. 829 and ad Aristoph. nub. 192; Wahl, Clav. 79 sq. See in opposition, Klotz 234, 247. Lastly, Klotz 236, 238 appears to be right in contradicting the 397
current assertion, that even in prose authors (such as Her. see Kühner 6th ed.
II. 453) it is not unusual, in the lively movement of thought, to put γάρ with the causal clause before the clause it is intended to substantiate (see Matthiae, Eurip. Phoen. p. 371; Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 207; Rost, Gr. 738[2]); in reference to the N. T. (Fr. 2 diss. in 2 Cor. p. 18 sq.; Tholuck 468
on Jno. iv. 44 and Heb. ii. 8) this observation was in fact unnecessary. Meyer has, beyond doubt, correctly explained Jno. iv. 44. In Heb. ii. 8 the words ἐν γὰρ τῷ ὑποτάξαι τὰ πάντα contain the proof of there being nothing which was not put in subjection to him according to God's purpose, 417
indirectly therefore of vs. 5 that the world to come also is put in subjection 7th ed.
to him; while νῦν δὲ οὔπω etc. shows that this subjection has at least begun to be carried into effect. The Scriptural promise must be distinguished from its actual fulfilment, which, however, has already commenced. 2 Cor. ix. 1 stands in obvious connection with viii. 24. 1 Cor. iv. 4 οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐμαυτῷ σύνοιδα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι is to be translated: *I am conscious, to be sure, to myself of nothing, yet* etc.

d) γάρ occurs several times in succession with change of reference: Rom. ii. 11–14; iv. 13–15; v. 6, 7; viii. 5 f.; x. 2–5; xvi. 18 f.; Jas. i. 6, 7; ii. 10; iv. 14; 1 Cor. iii. 3–5; ix. 16 f.; Heb. vii. 12–14 (Lycurg. 24, 1; 32, 3) see Engelhardt, Plat. Apol. p. 225; Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. 183 sq. In such passages γάρ often gives the ground of a series of separate thoughts subordinate one to another (Jas. i. 6; 1 Cor. xi. 8; Rom. viii. 5 ff.),

[1] The energy which resides in such questions with γάρ proceeds from their being prompted by the very words of the other party, or by the circumstances; a right being thus conferred to demand an answer, e.g. 1 Cor. xi. 22.

[2] *Hm.* Eurip. Iphig. Taur. p. 70: saepe in ratione reddenda invertunt Graeci ordinem sententiarum, caussam praemittentes: quo genere loquendi saepissime usus est Herodotus. Cf. also *Hoogeveen* I. 252.

see Fr. Rom. II. 111. Sometimes, however, the same words are repeated with γάρ in order to introduce some addition to what has been said, Rom. xv. 27 (not 2 Cor. v. 4).

Καὶ γάρ is equivalent either to *etenim* (merely connecting) or *nam etiam* (giving prominence) Klotz, Devar. II. 642 sq. This latter signification has frequently been overlooked by expositors, even those of the N. T. (Weber, Demosth. p. 271; Fr. Rom. II. p. 433). Thus in Jno. iv. 23; Acts xix. 40; Rom. xi. 1; xv. 3; xvi. 2; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. ii. 10, etc.; in several of these passages even Wahl renders καὶ γάρ by *etenim*. Τε γάρ in Rom. vii. 7 means *for also*, or *for indeed*, Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 176; Schaef. Dem. II. 579 and Plutarch. IV. 324; Klotz, Devar. II. 749 sqq.; but in Heb. ii. 11 (Rom. i. 26) τε and καί correspond, and in 2 Cor. x. 8 there is probably an anacoluthon, Klotz l.c. 749.

Ἐπεί passed from a particle of *time* into a causal particle, like our *since* and the Latin *quando*. Ἐπειδή answers entirely to *quoniam* (from quom — quum — jam). Ἐπείπερ *since indeed* (Hm. Vig. 786) occurs only in Rom. iii. 30 (yet not without var.), see Fr. in loc. [Ἐπειδήπερ *forasmuch as, since now* (Aristot. Phys. 8, 5; Dion. Hal. 2, 72; Philo ad Caj. § 25 and used by the best Greek authors, see Hartung, Partikell. I. S. 342 sq.) occurs in the N. T. only in Luke i. 1.]

Καθώς and ὡς, in appended clauses, denote explanation rather than strict confirmation, and resemble the Latin (*quoniam*) *quippe, siquidem*, and the antiquated (Germ.) *sintemal*. On ὡς (in 2 Tim. i. 3; Gal. vi. 10; Matt. vi. 12 it means *as*) cf. Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 336; Stallb. Plat. sympos. p. 135; Lehmann, Lucian. I. 457; III. 425 etc.

398 As to ἐφ' ᾧ *on this account that*, see p. 394.

6th ed. c. Εἰ has the compound forms εἴγε if that is *since, quandoquidem* (when no
439 doubt exists) and εἴπερ *if indeed* (when no decision is implied), Hm. Vig. p. 834; cf. Klotz. Devar. II. 308, 528, which occur almost exclusively in Paul. The distinction pointed out is obvious in most passages; as to Eph. iii. 2, see Mey. 1 Pet. ii. 3, and probably also 2 Thess. i. 6, appears to be of a
418 rhetorical nature. On these passages, as well as Rom. viii. 9; Col. i. 23,
7th ed. see Fr. Prälimin. S. 67 f. Εἰ itself retains the signification *if*, even where in point of meaning it stands for ἐπεί *since* (Acts iv. 9; Rom. xi. 21; 1 Jno. iv. 11; 2 Pet. ii. 4, etc.); the sentence is in form conditional: *if* (as is actually the case), and the categoric force for the moment does not come into view. Sometimes there is a rhetorical reason for this usage (Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 195; Bornem. Xen. conv. p. 101). So also in expressions in which it may be rendered by *that*, see § 60, 6. Εἰ denoting a wish. *if only, O that*, for which Greek authors usually employ εἴθε or εἰ γάρ (Klotz, Devar. II. 516), occurs, according to the punctuation adopted by recent editors, in Luke xii. 49 καὶ τί θέλω; εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη *and what do I wish?* (answer) *if it were* (only) *already kindled;* see Mey. [in his earlier eds.] in loc. With regard to the Aorist, see Klotz l.c.: si de aliqua

re sermo est, de qua, quum non facta sit olim, nunc nobis gratum fore significamus, si facta esset illo tempore. Such a question, however, seems rather artificial in the mouth of Jesus. Of the objections which Mey. brings against the common exposition, *How I wish that it were already kindled!* the second, so far as usage goes, is less forcible than the first. [But Mey. now (4th ed.) acknowledges the common interpretation to be correct.]

9. *Final* clauses are expressed by means of the conjunctions ἵνα, ὅπως (ὡς). *Objective* clauses,[1] which as they express the object of the principal clause in the form of a perception or judgment merely unfold its predicate, and consequently assume the place of the Objective case in a simple sentence (Thiersch, gr. Grammat. S. 605), *I see that this is good*, *I say that he is rich*, are introduced by ὅτι or ὡς. Yet conjunctions are the less indispensable for both kinds of clauses as both may be conveniently expressed by means of the Infinitive, § 44.

Ὅτι is the proper objective particle, like *quod* and *that*. It is used in this sense e.g. also after solemn asseverations, as in 2 Cor. xi. 10 ἔστιν ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, Gal. i. 20 ἰδοὺ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, 2 Cor. i. 18 πιστὸς ὁ θεός, Rom. xiv. 11, for these include the idea *I aver*, cf. Fr. Rom. II. 242 sq. In this way, too, is ὅτι to be taken when it introduces direct discourse, Mdv. p. 222; cf. Weber, Demosth. p. 346.

Ὡς (Adv. from the pronoun ὅς Klotz, Devar. II. 757) likewise signifies, after verbs of *knowing*, *saying* etc., *how*, *ut* (Klotz p. 765) Acts x. 28 470
ἐπίστασθε, ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ *ye know, how* (that) *it is unlawful for a Jew*. Thus the two conjunctions ὅτι and ὡς, when used in objective 399
sentences, proceed from different conceptions of the object, but coincide 6th ed.
in sense.

Ὅπως, like *ut* (quo), besides being an adverb (*how*, πῶς Klotz, Devar. II. 681, cf. Luke xxiv. 20), has become a conjunction. Ἵνα was originally 419
a relative adverb, *where*, *whither* (Klotz, as above, p. 616). From local 7th ed.
direction it was transferred to direction of the will (design), and thus resembles the Latin *quo*. In the N. T. ὡς expressing design (Klotz p. 760) occurs only in the well-known phrase ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, Heb. vii. 9; cf. Mtth. 1265, which, however, recent grammarians are inclined to explain otherwise, Klotz II. 765; Madv. 164. (How ἵνα in the N. T. is used also instead of the simple Inf., see p. 334 sqq.)

10. The regular use of all these conjunctions, framed as they were to express the several relations of clauses, would be quite annulled, had the N. T. writers actually employed one conjunction

[1] *Weller*, über Subjects ... und Objectssätze etc. Meining. 1845. 4to.

for another — if with them δέ often were equivalent to γάρ, γάρ to οὖν, ἵνα to ὥστε, etc.[1] — as expositors, following indeed the scholiasts (Fischer ad Palaeph. p. 6) and earlier philologists, long assumed (Pott, Heinrichs, Flatt, Kühnöl, Schott, even D. Schulz), and as the Hermeneutics of the time (Keil, Hermen. S. 67) taught.

471 But such interchange is in every instance only apparent. It rests in part on the circumstance, that the relation of two sentences to each other may be conceived sometimes in several ways[2]; and thus the particular logical connection in a given passage may depend on the conception of the individual (or nation, see below on ἵνα), one which is unfamiliar to the reader; and in part on a
400 conciseness of expression foreign to the genius of our language.
6th ed. Wherever the apostles use a δέ they have always thought somehow of a *but;* and it is the expositor's duty to reproduce for himself in
420 like manner the connection of thought, and not for convenience'
7th ed. sake to imagine an interchange of conjunctions perhaps of opposite import. For how absurd to suppose that the apostles actually used *for* when they intended to say *but*, or *but* when they should have written *for!* Any child can distinguish such relations. And how stupid they must have been to think of employing instead of *for* its opposite *therefore!* None but expositors who had never accustomed themselves to view language as *living* speech, or who shrank from the labor of precise thought, could have indulged such an

[1] Even the better expositors are not free from this arbitrariness: thus Beza in 1 Cor. viii. 7 takes ἀλλά for *itaque*. See in opposition to such interpretation my Progr. Conjunctionum in N. T. accuratius explicandar. caussae et exempla. Erlang. 1826. 4to. It is really strange to see how the commentaries (till within a few decades) undertake again and again to dictate to the apostles, and force upon them almost always some other conjunction than that actually employed in the text. Were we to reckon up the passages, there would certainly remain e.g. in Paul's epistles not more than six or eight in which the apostle has selected the *right* particle, and not required the subsequent aid of an expositor. This has made the interpretation of the N. T. very arbitrary. Are we not to believe that Paul and Luke knew more Greek than many of their domineering expositors? No one in this matter can appeal to the Hebrew who has not a most irrational idea of that language. Such arbitrary substitutions of one thing for another are impossible in any human speech. Besides, the arbitrariness of the interpreters was the more manifest, because different expositors often attributed to a conjunction senses entirely different in the same passage: (in 2 Cor. viii. 7 e.g ἀλλά according to some is put for γάρ; according to others, for οὖν etc.; in Heb. v. 11 καί according to some is put for ἀλλά, but according to others means *licet*. In Heb. iii. 10 *Kühnöl* leaves it optional whether δέ is taken for καί or in the sense of *nam*). Thus purely private opinion has here the freest range. Moreover, the *translators* of the books of the N. T. (even the excellent *Schulz* in the Epistle to the Hebrews) deserve censure for rendering the conjunctions most capriciously.

[2] Cf., as to such a case, *Klotz* II. p. 5, and the remarks made below (after explaining οὖν), p. 455 sq.

imagination; and it is no honor to biblical exegesis that such principles so long found approval. In human thought connected ideas are always related ideas. Whenever, therefore, a conjunction is used in a sense apparently foreign to it, the very first endeavor must be to show the *process* by which the writer's mind passed from the primary to the unusual signification. But this was not thought of; had serious thought been given to it, the delusion of which we have been speaking would have vanished in a moment.

As the unlimited interchange of conjunctions is a pure fiction, so too is the notion that they are *weakened*; according to which even the more forcible particles, as *for*, *but*, are represented as being quite superfluous or mere particles of transition (see e.g. no. 3 below). Recent exegetes, indeed, have abandoned this 472
arbitrary but convenient rule of interpretation. We will therefore single out only a few especially specious passages, in which the conjunctions employed were for a long time not acquiesced in, or where even the better expositors are not agreed about the connection of thought.

1. Ἀλλά does not stand

a) for οὖν: In 2 Cor. viii. 7 ἀλλά simply means *but, at:* from Titus, to whom he had given instructions, Paul turns to exhort his readers on their part to do what was desired; for the clause with ἵνα is to be taken imperatively. Eph. v. 24 is not an inference from vs. 23; but the statement in vs. 22, that wives should be subject to their husbands ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ, is proved in vss. 23, 24 first from the *position* of Christ and of the husband, both being κεφαλαί, *but* secondly — and this is the main argument — from the *claim* (to be obeyed) which, as for Christ so for the husband, flows from this position. And vs. 24, so far from being a mere repetition of what is stated in vs. 22, concludes the argument, and explains ὑποτάσσ. τοῖς ἀνδρ. ὡς τῷ κυρίῳ. The expressive apposition also, αὐτὸς σωτήρ etc., does not interrupt the train of thought; whereas the exposition of Mey., who regards these words as an independent sentence, introduces a statement that obstructs the line of argument. As to Acts x. 20 (Elsner in loc.), see above, no. 7. p. 442.

b) for εἰ μή: In Mark ix. 8 οὐκέτι οὐδένα εἶδον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον 421
means, they *no longer* saw any one (of those that they had *previously* 7th ed.
seen, vs. 4), but (they saw) Jesus alone. In Matt. xx. 23 (Raphel and 401
Alberti in loc.) δοθήσεται, borrowed from δοῦναι, is to be repeated after 6th ed.
ἀλλά, and the conjunction signifies *but*.

c) for *sane, profecto:* neither in Jno. viii. 26 see no. 7 p. 442, nor in xvi. 2, where it denotes *imo* or *at* as in Acts xix. 2; 1 Cor. vi. 6. Rom. vi. 5, where ἀλλά (καί) occurs in the apodosis, does not come under this head.

2. Δέ never means

a) *therefore, then:* In 1 Cor. xi. 28 it signifies *but*, in antithesis to vs. 27 ἀναξίως ἐσθίειν, *but let a man examine himself* (in order to avoid bringing on himself such guilt). In 1 Cor. viii. 9 a practical restriction, in the form of an admonition, is annexed to the general principle laid down in vs. 8: *but* see to it that this liberty do not become etc. In Rom. viii. 8, if Paul had intended to present θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται as an inference from what precedes he might have continued with *therefore* (as Rück. explains δέ); but he passes from ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν to the other aspect of the matter θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται, — a transition which would have surprised no one had
473 there been no parenthetical clause. In Jas. ii. 15 δέ, if genuine, means *jam vero, atqui*.

b) *for* (Poppo, Thuc. II. 291; Ind. ad Xen. Cyr., and Bornem. ind. ad Xen. Anab.; see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 846; Schaef. Demosth. II. 128 sq.; V. 541; Lehm. Lucian. I. 197; Wex, Antig. I. 300 sq.):[1] In Mark xvi. 8 εἶχε δέ is merely explanatory; the *cause* of this τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις is stated in the words ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ; some good Codd., however, which Lchm. follows, [Sin. also] have γάρ in the first passage. In Jno. vi. 10 the words ἦν δὲ χόρτος etc. are also a supplementary explanation; see above. In 1 Thess. ii. 16 ἔφθασε δέ forms a contrast to the intention of the Jews ἀναπληρ. αὐτῶν τ. ἁμαρτ.: *but* (as, in fact, they would have it so) *the punishment for this is come on them.* In Matt. xxiii. 5 πλατύνουσι δέ etc. are special illustrations of πάντα τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ποιοῦσι πρὸς τὸ θεαθῆναι; the γάρ, adopted by the more recent editors, probably owes its origin to scribes who were troubled by δέ. In 1 Tim. iii. 5 εἰ δέ τις etc. means, *but if one* etc.; the sentence, as will be seen by referring to vs. 6, is a parenthetical antithesis to τοῦ ἰδίου οἴκου προϊστάμενον. In 1 Cor. iv. 7 *who distinguisheth thee* (declares thee pre-eminent)? *but what hast thou, that thou didst not receive?* i.e. *but* if thou appealest to the pre-eminence which thou possessest, I ask thee, hast thou not received it? In 1 Cor. vii. 7 (Flatt, Schott) δέ signifies *potius*. In 1 Cor. x. 11 ἐγράφη δέ, as even the leading position of the verb indicates, forms an antithesis to the statement that precedes: all these things happened etc.; *but they were written* etc. In 1 Cor. xv. 13 δέ is a genuine adversative: if Christ is
422 risen, then the resurrection of the dead is a reality; *but* if the resurrection
7th ed. of the dead is not a reality, then (by converse reasoning) neither is Christ risen. Verse 14 contains a further inference: *but* if Christ is not risen,
402 then etc. The one statement of necessity establishes or invalidates the
6th ed. other. In 2 Pet. i. 13 δέ forms the antithesis to the words καίπερ εἰδότας etc. On Phil. iv. 18 see Mey.

[1] In the sense of *namely, that is*, both conjunctions coincide: by means of δέ a new clause is annexed which is part of the statement; while by means of γάρ a clause is presented as a confirmatory illustration of what precedes. The latter mode of expression is often in substance equivalent to the former, see *Hm.* Vig. p. 845.

c) Nor does it ever serve as a mere copula or particle of transition: Matt. xxi. 3 (Schott) *say, the Lord hath need of them; and straightway he will send them*, i.e. these words will not be without effect; *but*, on the contrary, he will straightway etc. In Acts xxiv. 17 the narration proceeds by means of δέ to another event. In 1 Cor. xiv. 1 δέ means *but: but* the διώκειν τὴν ἀγάπην must not prevent you from ζηλοῦν τὰ πν. On 2 Cor. ii. 12 Meyer's opinion is more correct than de Wette's; Paul refers to vs. 4. In 1 Cor. xi. 2 it would be a mistake to regard, as Rück. does, δέ as indicating merely the advance to a new topic (Luther has not translated it at all, while Schott renders it by *quidem*); the words connect themselves (directly) with the exhortation immediately preceding, μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε: 474
yet (while I thus urge you, I do not mean to blame you) *I praise you* etc. Likewise in Rom. iv. 3 Luther and many other translators have neglected δέ (at the beginning of a quotation where the Sept. has καί); but Paul is probably as little chargeable as James (ii. 23) with having used the adversative particle wantonly or without meaning. It renders ἐπίστευσε more forcible, not to say almost antithetic.

3. Γάρ is incorrectly taken

a) for the adversative *but* (Markland, Eur. suppl. vs. 8; Elmsley, Eur. Med. 121; see, on the other hand, Hm. Vig. 846; Bremi in the n. krit. Journ. IX. 533): In 2 Cor. xii. 20 *I say all that for your edification; for I fear etc.* (this is the very reason that I say it). In Rom. iv. 13 the clause with γάρ confirms the last words of the preceding verse, ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως τοῦ πατρός etc. In Rom. v. 6 f. the first γάρ simply refers to the fact which attested the love of God (vs. 5), — Christ's dying for the ungodly; the second γάρ explains, a contrario, how death (of the innocent) for the guilty evinces transcendent love; the third γάρ substantiates the remark μόλις ὑπὲρ δικαίου etc. 1 Cor. v. 3 means: and *ye*, have ye not felt yourselves compelled to exclude the man? *for I* (for my part), *absent in body, ... have already decided* etc. It was, therefore, surely to be expected that ye, who have him before your eyes, would have applied the (milder) punishment of exclusion. Pott understands γάρ here in the sense of *alias!* As to 1 Cor. iv. 9 see above, p. 446 a). 2 Cor. xii. 6 is: *of myself I will not boast; for if I should desire to boast, I shall not be a fool* (therefore, I might do so). In Phil. iii. 20 ἡμῶν γάρ etc. stands in closest relation to οἱ τὰ ἐπίγεια φρον. *they that mind earthly things!* (a summary of vs. 19), *for our* conversation is in heaven (on this very account I warn you against them, vs. 18 f.). In Rom. viii. 6 the clause with γάρ states the reason why οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα (vs. 4) τὰ τοῦ πν. φρονοῦσιν, which is, that the φρόνημα τῆς σαρκός leads to death, but the φρόν. τοῦ πν. to life; vs. 5, 423
however, is confirmatory of vs. 4. In Col. ii. 1 Bengel had already in- 7th ed.
dicated the correct interpretation. Heb. vii. 12 (Kühnöl: *autem*) appends the reason for vs. 11: *for* change in the priestly succession and abolition of the law necessarily go together, see Bleek in loc. 2 Pet. iii. 5 explains

(Pott) how such men can come forward with such frivolous assertions as
403 in vss. 3, 4. Heb. xii. 3 enforces the preceding resolution τρέχωμεν etc., by
6th ed. reference to the example of Christ.

b) for *therefore, then:* Bengel's remark throws light on Luke xii. 58: γάρ saepe ponitur, ubi propositionem excipit tractatio. 1 Cor. xi. 26 elucidates the expression εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν vs. 25. In Rom. ii. 28
475 the connection is this: the uncircumcised, who lives agreeably to the law, may convict thee, who, though circumcised, transgressest the law; *for* it is not what is external (like circumcision) *that constitutes the real Jew.* On Heb. ii. 8 see above, p. 447.

c) for *although:* as in Jno. iv. 44 (see Kühnöl); but γάρ is simply *for;* πατρίς can only mean Galilee, vs. 43.

d) for *on the contrary:* 2 Pet. i. 9 (Augusti). Δέ might have been used, if the apostle had intended to say: *but he, on the contrary, who lacks these* (virtues) etc. With γάρ, the sentence confirms (illustrates) the foregoing οὐκ ἀργοὺς ... Χριστοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν a contrario (μή): *for he that lacks these,* is blind. This interpretation supplies, too, a more forcible reason for the exhortation in vs. 10.

e) for ἀλλ' ὅμως *nevertheless:* 2 Cor. xii. 1 (where indeed the reading is extremely uncertain; yet the common reading δή is not so decidedly incorrect as Mey. insists) *to boast* (xi. 22 ff.) *is not expedient for me surely; for I will* (*I will, that is to say,* Klotz, Devar. II. 235) *now come to visions and revelations of the Lord.* Paul in this passage contrasts (cf. vs. 5) *boasting of himself* (of his own merits) with boasting of the divine marks of distinction accorded him. Of these last he will boast, vs. 5. Accordingly, the meaning is: *yet glorying in self is not expedient; for now will I come to a subject for glorying that excludes all self-glorification and renders it superfluous.*

f) for the mere copula: In Rom. iii. 2 πρῶτον μὲν γάρ commences the *proof* of the statement πολὺ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον. Acts ix. 11 *inquire in the house of Judas for Saul of Tarsus; for, behold, he prayeth* (thou wilt therefore find him there), *and he hath seen a vision* (which has prepared him to receive thee), cf. Bengel in loc. In Acts xvii. 28 τοῦ γὰρ γένος etc. is a verse quoted verbatim from Aratus, where, moreover, γάρ may be taken as confirmatory of ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν. In Acts iv. 12 the clause οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν etc. serves to unfold, and thus to establish, the statement ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἡ σωτηρία; and what the second clause adds to the first the attentive reader will easily perceive. In Acts xiii. 27 we may, with Bengel, Meyer, and others, restore the connection thus: *to you, ye* (foreign) *Jews* etc. *is this word of salvation addressed; for those at Jerusalem have despised this Saviour.* It is more probable,
424 however, that Paul intended to proceed thus: *for* he is proved to be the
7th ed. Messiah foretold to our fathers, cf. vss. 29, 32 ff. The recital of the facts in which the prophecies were fulfilled, impairs, however, the formal com-

pactness of the reasoning. At all events γάρ is not a mere particle of transition, as Kühnöl asserts. In 2 Cor. iii. 9 it appears to me that the words εἰ γὰρ ἡ διακ. etc. go so far towards establishing the apostle's thought as διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης expresses something more definite than διακονία 476
τοῦ πνεύματος: *if the ministration of death was glorious, ... how shall not the ministration of the Spirit be much more glorious?* Fr.'s exposition, in his diss. Corinth. I. p. 18 sq., seems to me artificial. In Matt. i. 18 404
(Schott), after the words τοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χρ. ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν, the details 6th ed.
commence as is not unusual with γάρ *namely.*

4. Οὖν is falsely taken

a) for *but:* Acts ii. 30 (Kühnöl) προφ. οὖν ὑπάρχ. is simply an inference from the sentence that precedes: David died and was buried. He *therefore*, in his character of prophet, referred to Christ's resurrection in the words which he used apparently in reference to himself. Acts xxvi. 22 is not antithetic to vs. 21; but Paul, reviewing his apostolic life up to this imprisonment, concludes: *by the help of God, therefore, I continue until this day*, etc. Even Kühnöl, in his Comment. p. 805, accurately renders οὖν by *igitur;* but in the index οὖν is represented as here denoting *sed, tamen!* In Matt. xxvii. 22 τί οὖν ποιήσω Ἰησοῦν is: *what then shall I do with Jesus* (since you have decided in favor of Barabbas)?

b) for *for.* In Matt. x. 32 πᾶς οὖν ὅστις is not confirmatory of the clause πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε ὑμεῖς, but resumes and continues the main thought vs. 27 κηρύξατε etc. καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε. Fr. is of a different opinion. In the parallel passage, Luke xii. 8 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν· πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ etc., the δέ is substantially the same in sense but more expressive. In 1 Cor. iii. 5 τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ... Ἀπολλώς; *who, then* (to follow out your party-strifes), *is ... Apollos?* In 1 Cor. vii. 26 οὖν introduces the γνώμη which the apostle proposes in vs. 25 to give.

c) for a mere copula, or as wholly superfluous: Rom. xv. 17 (Köllner) becomes at once plain by a reference to vss. 15, 16 (διὰ τὴν χάριν etc). The οὖν in Matt. v. 23 is entirely overlooked even by Schott; but it unquestionably introduces, however, a practical inference (admonition) from vs. 22 (the punishableness of anger etc.). It is more difficult to determine the connection in Matt. vii. 12, and even the more recent expositors differ widely from each other. Tholuck's exposition is probably correct, though his review of the various interpretations is far from complete. In Jno. viii. 38 καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε the οὖν is far from being redundant; it contrasts with sad irony the conduct of the Jews (*you also, therefore*) with the conduct of Jesus, representing both as following the same principle.

Of the preceding *four* conjunctions δέ and οὖν are the most closely allied; and hence there are passages where either might have been employed with equal propriety (e.g. Matt. xviii. 31), though even in the mere continuation of discourse (in narration) they are not strictly equiv-

477 alent. Instead of: *Jesus found two fishermen, who ... And (but) he said*
425 *to them* etc., I can also say: *Jesus found ... So (then) he said to them.*
7th ed. The change does not greatly affect the sense, but still there is a difference of conception between the two. In the first case, to the coming and finding them the speaking is annexed as something new and different; in the last, the thought is this: *he said then* (availing himself of the opportunity) *to them.* If in such an instance the narrator employs δέ, it cannot be asserted that he ought to have used οὖν; or vice versa. Γάρ and δέ, also, can sometimes be used with equal propriety (see 10, 2, b) p. 452): In Jno. vi. 10 the evangelist wrote: Jesus said, make the people recline; *now* (but) there was much grass in the place. He might also have written: *for* there was much grass, etc. In the latter case he represents the circum-
405 stance as the incidental cause of the direction; in the former, it is given
6th ed. as merely explanatory; see Klotz II. 362; cf. Hm. Vig. 845 sq. Here also then there is a difference of conception in the two cases. Consequently we may not adduce parallel passages, such as Luke xiii. 35, cf. Matt. xxiii. 39, as proof of the perfect equality of δέ and γάρ. Even, however, if in such cases δέ and οὖν, δέ and γάρ, are *pretty nearly* equivalent, it does not follow that they are interchangeable in all, even their more precise, significations. On the other hand, γάρ and ἀλλά are particles of far too definitive a nature to admit of their being used for each other at will, or even being unimportant. Finally, even in the most ancient Codd. (and versions[1]) numerous variations are found, in respect to the conjunctions δέ and γάρ Matt. xxiii. 5; Mark v. 42; xii. 2; xiv. 2; Luke x. 42; xii. 30; xx. 40; Jno. ix. 11; xi. 30, etc.; Rom. iv. 15 (Fr. Rom. II. 476), δέ and οὖν Luke x. 37; xiii. 18; xv. 28; Jno. vi. 3; ix. 26; x. 20; xii. 44; xix. 16; Acts xxviii. 9 etc., οὖν and γάρ Acts xxv. 11; Rom. iii. 28.

5. Ὅτι is not equivalent

a) to διό *wherefore* (as the Hebrew כִּי, but likewise erroneously, is sometimes rendered; see my Simonis under the word, yet see Passow
478 under ὅτι): In Luke vii. 47 nothing but a blind hostility to the Catholics (see Grotius and Calov. in loc.) could misinterpret ὅτι, see Mey. in loc. As to 2 Cor. xi. 10 see above, no. 9 p. 449.

Nor is this particle used for διὰ τί in direct question (Palairet, observ. 125; Alberti, observ. 151; Krebs, observ. 50; Griesbach, commentar. crit. II. 138; Schweigh. lexic. Herod. II. 161 [Bttm. Gramm. des N. T.

[1] These latter, therefore, where conjunctions are concerned, ought not to be cited in a critical apparatus as authorities without great caution. Yet in general, nothing has been treated so negligently by the earlier critics as the ancient versions; even the better known and most accessible are, ten to one, brought forward incorrectly, — when, that is to say, either from the nature of the language or the principles on which they were executed they can be made to furnish no evidence respecting a various reading. But it is to be regretted that even in the most recent editions this part of the critical apparatus still appears unsifted.

Sprachgebr. S. 218]) in Mark ix. 11; even de Wette so understands it, and in support of his opinion refers to the passages which Krebs adduces from Josephus, not considering that there ὅ τι (ὅ,τι, as Lchm. printed it) is used as a pronoun in an indirect question, — a usage that assuredly does not require proofs from Josephus (Kypke I. 178). But as to this passage, 426
see above, p. 167. Fr. was disposed on very slight authority to read τί 7th ed.
οὖν (from Matt.), which is undoubtedly a correction. In Mark ix. 28 the best Codd. (even the Alex. [but not Sin.]) give διὰ τί, as in Matt. xvii. 19. In Mark ii. 16 Cod. D at least gives the same [likewise Cod. Sin.], yet Lachm. reads τί ὅτι. But ὅτι, though admitted as the true reading, would not necessarily be an interrogative. As to Jno. viii. 25 (Lücke), see § 54, 1 p. 464.

b) to *quanquam:* Kühnöl renders Luke xi. 48 *though* they killed them, yet ye etc. Beza had already given the right exposition of the passage. In Matt. xi. 25 Kühnöl has himself, in the fourth edition, given up this interpretation; and in his third edition also explains correctly Jno. viii. 45.

c) to ὅτε. As to 1 Jno. iii. 14, see BCrus. In 1 Cor. iii. 13 (Pott) ὅτι obviously specifies why ἡ ἡμέρα δηλώσει etc. Everybody is aware that ὅτι and ὅτε have often been interchanged by the transcribers (cf. Jno. xii. 41; 1 Cor. xii. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 20, etc.); see Schaef. Greg. Cor. p. 491; Schneider, Plat. rep. I. 393; Siebelis, ind. Pausan. p. 259. Accordingly in the Sept. wherever ὅτι appears to have the meaning of *when* or *as*, we must un- 406
hesitatingly read ὅτε (even in 1 Kings viii. 37), as the recent editions give 6th ed.
on good manuscript authority in all the passages quoted by Pott on 1 Cor. as above.

d) to *profecto:* In Matt. xxvi. 74 ὅτι is recitative; on the other hand, in 2 Cor. xi. 10 it means *that* (as after solemn oaths), see above, no. 9 p. 449. In Rom. xiv. 11 (from Isa. xlv. 23) the sense is: *I swear by my life, that* etc.

Lastly, for a refutation of the assertion that ὅτι is equivalent to ὅς, as according to some is the case in Matt. v. 45, see Fr. in loc. Vs. 45 declares that by ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς ἐχθρούς etc. they will become children of their Father in heaven, and proves this from that Father's treatment of the πονηροί.

6. Ἵνα *to the end that, in order that* (sometimes preceded by a preparatory εἰς τοῦτο, Jno. xviii. 37; Acts ix. 21; Rom. xiv. 9, etc.), is said to be 479
frequently employed in the N. T. ἐκβατικῶς to denote the actual *consequence* (Glass. ed. Dathe I. 539 sqq.), as it has sometimes been taken in Greek authors also, see Hoogeveen, doctr. particul. I. 524 sq., the annotations on Lucian. Nigr. 30; Weiske, Xen. Anab. 7, 3, 28; cf. also Ewald, Apocal. p. 233. Now even if this were possible as a general principle, inasmuch as the Latin *ut* denotes both design and result (though the gradual weakening of ἵνα in later Greek see § 44, 8 is no proof of it), yet no one will

deny that expositors have made most immoderate use of this principle and are chargeable with great exaggeration.[1] The alleged use, wholly unknown e.g. to Devar., was denied by Lehmann, Lucian. Tom. I. 71, and afterwards by Fr. Matt. exc. 1, and by Beyer in the n. krit. Journ. IV. 418 ff.; yet cf. also Lücke, Comment. on Jo. II. 371 f.; Mey. on Matt. i. 22. Beyer's view was combated by Steudel in Bengel's n. Archiv IV. 504 f.; and Tittmann, Synon. II. 35 sqq., has also declared himself in favor of ἵνα
427 ἐκβατικόν.[2] Others, as Olshausen, bibl. Comment. II. 250 and Bleek, Heb.
7th ed. II. I. 283, are for admitting the ecbatic sense at least in single passages; [Bttm., too, (Gramm. des N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 206) asserts that there are passages of the N. T. where ἵνα has more of the ecbatic sense than of the final, and where we shall come nearer the author's thought if we translate it by *so that* (i.e. ὥστε with Inf.).] In the first place, most expositors have hitherto overlooked the fact that their judgment of the use of ἵνα is often to be shaped in accordance with Hebrew *teleology*, which interchanges historic results with divine designs and decrees, or rather represents every (important, and especially every surprising) event as ordered and designed by God (cf. e.g. Exod. xi. 9; Isa. vi. 10, Knobel in loc.; cf. Rom. xi. 11; see BCrus. bibl. Theol. S. 272; Tholuck, Ausleg. d. Br. a. d. Röm. 3 Aufl. S. 395 ff.),[3] and that on this account ἵνα may oftentimes be used in the biblical dialect where *we*, agreeably to our
407 conception of the divine government of the world, should have employed
6th ed. ὥστε. Other passages have not been examined attentively enough; else it would have become evident that even according to the *ordinary* modes
480 of thought ἵνα is employed there correctly. In still other passages it has escaped observation that sometimes the expression *to, in order to*, is employed for rhetorical reasons, by a sort of hyperbole (e.g. so then I must go there in order to get sick! cf. Isa. xxxvi. 12; Ps. li. 6; Liv. 3, 10; Plin. Paneg. 6, 4; I have, then, built a house in order to see it burn down!); or lastly, that ἵνα merely expresses (what in the regular course

[1] If indeed with *Kühnöl* (Hebr. p. 204) we lay it down as a principle that ἵνα denotes consilium only *saepius*, we shall easily make up our minds to take the conjunction ἐκβατικῶς.

[2] He thinks that even in Attic poets he has found instances of the kind. But Aristoph. nub. 58 δεῦρ' ἔλθ' ἵνα κλάῃς is obviously not one; and Aristoph. vesp. 313 receives its explanation in the remark soon to be made above. Likewise in Mr. Anton. 7, 25 ἵνα is undoubtedly τελικόν. How unceremoniously *Tittmann* disposes of the N. T. in order to make out his theory is apparent from his treatment (p. 45) of Jno. i. 7, where in fact no unprejudiced expositor will take the second ἵνα as ἐκβατικόν. Even *Kühnöl* has not done so.

[3] To assert that the Israelites *uniformly* confounded design and result (*Unger* de parabol. p. 173), would be saying too much. This took place only in their *religious* views of events (in devout speech, *BCrus.* Jo. I. 198). When these did not influence them the sharp distinction between *in order that* and *so that* must certainly have made itself felt by the Israelites. Their having in their language a special expression for *so that* shows that they had a correct notion of the distinction.

of nature and life is) the *necessary* result, one which is therefore so to speak unconsciously intended by the person that does some given act (cf. Lücke, Jo. I. 603; Fr. Rom. viii. 17), see below on Jno. ix. 2.

Passing over those examples which will be readily understood by the attentive reader (as 1 Pet. i. 7, where Pott from mere habit as it were takes ἵνα for ὥστε), we select the following, in which ἵνα is supposed even by good expositors to be used *de eventu:*

In Luke ix. 45 (the divine) purpose is indicated by ἵνα (cf. Matt. xi. 25): that they might not at that time perceive it (otherwise, they would have been perplexed with regard to Jesus). In Luke xiv. 10 ἵνα corresponds to μήποτε vs. 8, and very clearly expresses *design* (not without reference to the application of the parable): be humble, *in order that* thou mayest be deemed worthy of his heavenly kingdom; the *result* is indicated wholly in τότε ἔσται etc. As to Mark iv. 12 (Schott) see Fr. and Olsh. and below, 428
p. 461. Cf. also Luke xi. 50; Matt. xxiii. 34 f. In Jno. iv. 36 the sense 7th ed.
is: this is so ordered *in order that* etc. In Jno. vii. 23 (Steudel) the words ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως express the design underlying the custom περιτομὴν λαμβάνει ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ. Jno. ix. 2 is to be explained by the Jewish theory of final causes, which in its national exaggeration the disciples shared. Severe, inexplicable, bodily afflictions *must* be divinely ordained penalties for sin: who then by his sin has moved the penal justice of God to cause this man to be born blind? The *necessary* consequence (though undesignedly induced) of ἁμαρτάνειν is meant, see Lücke in loc. In Jno. xi. 15 ἵνα πιστεύσητε is added to δι' ὑμᾶς by way of explanation: I rejoice on your account (that I was not there), *to the end that ye may believe,* i.e. now ye cannot but believe. In Jno. xix. 28 ἵνα means *in order that,* whether with Luther we join ἵνα τελ. ἡ γραφή to πάντα ἤδη τετέλ. (so Mey.), or with Lücke and de Wette to the following λέγει; in the latter case ἵνα denotes a purpose attributed by John to Jesus. As to Jno. xvi. 24 see Lücke. In Rom. xi. 31 ἵνα does not indicate the design of the ἀπειθοῦντες, but God's decree which linked itself to this unbelief cf. vs. 32, to bring them salvation (not as merited, but) out of mercy. In connection with the divine plan, then, unbelief is designed etc., cf. also vs. 11. In the 408
same way is v. 20 f. to be explained, and probably also 2 Cor. i. 9. The 6th ed.
same teleological view clearly finds place in Jno. xii. 40 in a quotation from the O. T. Rom. ix. 11 only requires attention to be plain; and it is fairly surprising that Reiche should still take ἵνα as ecbatic. The meaning 481
of 2 Cor. v. 4 is obvious; and it passes comprehension how even Schott could render ἵνα by *ita ut.* In 1 Cor. v. 5 εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός shows how an intention of promoting the good of the πνεῦμα is connected with the apostolic παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ; beyond contradiction, therefore, ἵνα denotes *in order that.* In 1 Cor. vii. 29 the words ἵνα καὶ οἱ ἔχοντες etc. indicate the (divine) purpose of ὁ καιρὸς συνεσταλμένος etc. The same applies to Eph. ii. 9. In Eph. iii. 10 ἵνα γνωρισθῇ etc. is probably de-

pendent grammatically on τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου in vs. 9, see Mey. In Eph. iv. 14 ἵνα etc. expresses the negative design of what had been stated in vss. 11–13.

As to Gal. v. 17 (Usteri, BCrus.) see Mey. 1 Cor. xiv. 13 ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ προσευχέσθω, ἵνα διερμηνεύῃ means: *let him pray* (not in order to make a display of his χάρισμα τῶν γλωσσῶν, but) with the intention, for the purpose, of interpreting (the prayer). 1 Jno. iii. 1 *behold, how great love the Father has shown us* (with the intention) *that we should be called children of God;* see Lücke; BCrus. is not decided. In Rev. viii. 12 ἵνα expresses the object contemplated in the πλήττεσθαι of the sun etc.; for πλήττ. does not denote, as many suppose, the actual darkening of the heavenly bodies, but is the O. T. הִכָּה used in reference to the wrath of God, see Ewald in loc. In Rev. ix. 20 the intention of μετανοεῖν is expressed in ἵνα μή: they did not amend, *in order* no longer to serve demons etc. The discernment of the fact that the objects of their worship were
429 mere demons and wooden idols, should have led them to μετάνοια, *in order*
7th ed. *to* emancipate themselves from so degrading a worship. In 1 Thess. v. 4 (Schott, BCrus.) ἵνα denotes design on the part of God, see Lünemann. Under the telic sense comes also John's expression ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα ἵνα Jno. xii. 23: the hour is (by God's decree) come (consequently is present *in order*) *that* I etc., cf. xiii. 1; xvi. 2, 32. Inaccurate expositors took ἵνα in these passages as in 1 Cor. iv. 3; vii. 29 for ὅτε or ὅταν. 2 Cor. vii. 9 (Rück., Schott) ye were brought into sorrow, *in order that* (God's purpose) ye might be spared a more severe chastisement. *Ye did not rather mourn, in order that ... might be expelled?* Here, it is true, ὥστε might also be used if αἴρεσθαι were regarded as the natural result of πενθῆσαι. Paul, however, conceives of it as the end: ye should have mourned with this end in view, to expel him. In 2 Cor. xiii. 7 the double ἵνα indicates the aim of Paul's prayer: first negatively, then positively. The correct exposition of Rom. iii. 19 is probably now to be regarded as settled; see also Philippi. Only BCrus. still hesitates. As to Rom. viii. 17 see p. 459. In 2 Cor. i. 17, however, ἵνα preserves its meaning, whether we explain the passage: *what I resolve, do I resolve according to the flesh, that* (with
482 the intent that) *the yea with me may be* (unalterably) *yea, and the nay nay* (i.e. merely to show my own consistency)? or thus: *in order that with me there should be* (found) *yea yea, and nay nay* (that both should be found with me at the same time, that I should afterwards deny what I had
409 affirmed). In 2 Cor. iv. 7 ἵνα ἡ ὑπερβολή etc. refers to God's purpose in
6th ed. the fact that ἔχομεν τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον ἐν ὀστρακίνοις σκεύεσιν. In Heb. xi. 35 the words ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν indicate the purpose with which those persons refused the ἀπολύτρωσις. On Heb. xii. 27 see Bleek and de Wette. In Rev. xiv. 13 (Schott) probably ἀποθνήσκουσι (from ἀποθνήσκοντες) is to be repeated before ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται. Ewald and de Wette are of a different opinion, cf. above, § 43, 5, p. 317.

That the expression ἵνα (ὅπως) πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν in Matt. or ἡ γραφή, ὁ λόγος in John, which was for some time reduced to a mere *ita ut*, has in the mouth (of Jewish teachers and so) of Jesus and the apostles (when used in reference to an event which has *already occurred*) the more precise sense of *in order that it might be fulfilled*, cannot be doubted; cf. also Olsh. and Mey. on Matt. i. 22. But it certainly was not meant by this that God had caused an event to occur, or *impelled* men *inevitably* to act in a certain manner, for the very purpose of fulfilling the prophecies (Tittm. Synon. II. 44); the expression is very far from implying any sort of fatalism, Lücke Jo. II. 536.[1] With this expression, moreover, is Mark iv. 12 also to be classified: *all things are done to them in parables, in order that they* 450
may see and yet not perceive etc., for: in order that the declaration (in 7th ed.
Isa. vi. 10) may be fulfilled: *they will see and yet not* etc. We too are accustomed to interweave such quotations with our discourse, when they may be presumed to be well known. Jesus cannot intend to assert the *general impossibility* of understanding such parables (for then it would have been strange indeed to speak in parables at all); but means that to persons who do not comprehend parables so very plain might be applied the saying of the prophet: *he sees and understands not;* and that there would be such men had been expressly predicted.

In the defective diction of the Apocalypse ἵνα is apparently used once, xiii. 13, for ὥστε or ὡς, after an adjective including the notion of intensity: *magna miracula*, i.e. tam magna, *ut* etc. This would be as admissible at least as ὅτι after an intensive, cf. Ducas p. 34, 28, p. 182; Theophan. cont. p. 663; Cedren. II. 47; Canan. p. 465; Theod. H. E. 2, 6, p. 847 ed. Hal., and my Erlang. Pfingstprogr. 1830, p. 11. Yet see p. 338. It is otherwise in 1 Jno. i. 9 (a passage misconstrued even by de Wette and Schott): he is faithful and just, *in order* to forgive *us* (with a view to 483
forgive, that he may forgive); cf. in German: *er ist scharfsinnig, um einzusehen.* This expressed thus: *er ist scharfsinnig, so dass er einsieht*, conveys in substance the same meaning, yet exhibits the thought under an aspect somewhat different. Here belong also the passages quoted by Tittmann (Synon. II. 39) from Mr. Anton. 11, 3; Justin. M. p. 504. Bengel's remark on Rev. as above: ἵνα frequens Joanni particula; in omnibus suis libris non nisi semel, cap. 3, 16 ev., ὥστε posuit etc. is indeed 410
correct, yet is not to be understood as if John used ἵνα indiscriminately for 6th ed.
ὥστε. The reason why ὥστε so seldom occurs in John is partly owing to the doctrinal turn of his writings, and partly to the fact that he expresses *result* by other constructions.

[1] *Bengel*, on Matt. i. 22, says, in the doctrinal phraseology of his time yet in the main correctly, ubicunque haec locutio occurrit, gravitatem evangelistarum *tueri debemus* et, quamvis hebeti visu nostro, credere ab illis notari eventum non modo talem, qui formulae cuipiam veteri respondeat, sed plane talem, qui *propter veritatem divinam non potuerit non subsequi* incunte N. T.

Some insist that ἵνα is used for ὅτι in Mark ix. 12 γέγραπται ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα πολλὰ πάθῃ καὶ ἐξουδενωθῇ. But the words probably mean, *in order that he suffer;* this must be understood as an answer to the question, and ἔρχεται or ἐλεύσεται supplied before it. Nobody will be misled by the passage which Palairet (obs. 127) has quoted from Soph. Aj. 385 οὐχ ὁρᾷς, ἵν' εἶ κακοῦ; where ἵνα is an adverb. (Some take ὅπως for ὅτι, ὡς in Xen. C. 3, 3, 20; 8, 7, 20, see Poppo in loc.)

Many render also ὅπως *in order that* erroneously by *ita ut* (Kühnöl, Act. 129; Tittm. Synon. II. 55, 58). In Luke ii. 35 (BCrus.?) it is hardly necessary to refer to the Hebrew teleology to discover the meaning of the conjunction. Acts iii. 19 is plain if ὅπως ἀποστείλῃ τὸν Χρ. vs. 20 be understood of the opening of the kingdom of heaven, as vs. 21 requires. What was remarked in reference to ἵνα p. 457 sq. elucidates Matt. xxiii. 35. Philem. 6 is connected with vs. 4: *I make mention of thee in my prayers, in order that* etc. Meyer's objections to this reference are groundless. In Heb. ii. 9 (Kühnöl) the clause with ὅπως receives so much light from
431 vs. 10 that scarcely any expositor is now likely to render the ὅπως by *ita*
7th ed. *ut*. On ὅπως πληρωθῇ see above, p. 461.

Ὡς as a particle of comparison always means in the N. T. *as*, not *so* (for οὕτως), as in 1 Pet. iii. 6 Pott might have learnt even from Bengel. Nowhere also in the N. T. is there a reason for writing it ὥς — a form, moreover, very rare (Heind. and Stallb. Plat. Protag. c. 15) in prose writers (with the exception of the Ionic). In Heb. iii. 11; iv. 3 (Sept.) ὡς may be rendered by *that, so that;* in which sense it is sometimes used with the Indicative even in good Greek authors (Her. 1, 163; 2, 135). On Mark xiii. 34 and similar passages, see Fr.; to assume there with Mey. an anacoluthon is quite unnecessary.

1. Adverbs are so indispensable in defining closely relations of quality, that we can easily understand how it is that the N. T. writers, though inferior to the Greek prose authors as respects the use of conjunctions, have yet mastered pretty well the resources of the Greek tongue in adverbs, considered *extensively;* it is only when it is viewed *intensively*, i.e. as respects the finer shades of thought conveyed by several of the simple adverbs (e.g. ἄν) and by adverbial compounds, that their usage betrays them to be foreigners who did not feel the need of such refinements.

Derivative (adjectival) adverbs are the more numerous in the N. T., because the later Greek had derived from many adjectives
411 adverbial forms previously unknown, and had adopted into ordi-
6th ed. nary prose other words of the class which had hitherto been used

only in poetry. Cf. *ἀκαίρως* (Sir. xxxii. 4), *ἀναξίως* (2 Macc. xiv. 42), *ἀνόμως* (2 Macc. viii. 17), *ἀποτόμως* (since Polyb.), *ἐκτενῶς* (likewise; Lob. Phryn. 311), *ἀπερισπάστως* (likewise; Lob. 415), *ἑτοίμως* (for which the Attic language at least used *ἐξ ἑτοίμου*), *εὐθύμως* (since Polyb.), *ἐσχάτως* (cf. Lob. 389), *εὐαρέστως* (Arrian. Epict. 1, 12, 21), *κενῶς* (Arrian. Epict. 2, 17, 6 (*εἰς κενόν*), *προσφάτως*, *τελείως*, *πολυτρόπως* and *πολυμερῶς*, *ῥητῶς*, *ἐθνικῶς* in the biblical sense.

Among the remaining adverbs also some belong to later prose, and give offence to the grammarians; e.g. *ὑπερέκεινα* see Thom. M. 336, *οὐρανόθεν*, *παιδιόθεν*, *μακρόθεν* Lob. 93 sq.

The use of the adjective (or partic.) Neut.[1] for the corresponding adverb, which became more and more common in later Greek, does not exceed in the N. T. the limits observed in the earlier 432
prose: cf. *πρῶτον*, *ὕστερον*, *πρότερον* and *τὸ πρότερον*, *πλησίον*, 7th ed.
τυχόν, *ἔλαττον*, *πολύ*, *τὸ νῦν ἔχον* Acts xxiv. 25 *for the present* (Vig. p. 9, cf. Hm. p. 888), *τοὐναντίον*, *λοιπόν* and *τὸ λοιπόν* (Hm. Vig. 706), *ταχύ*, *πυκνά*, *ἴσα*, *μακρά*, *πολλά* (*often*, *σφόδρα*) and *τὰ πολλά* (*for the most part*), for most of which no adverbial forms existed.

In general, there is nothing peculiar in the N. T. diction in regard to the use of adjectives, with or without prepositions (elliptically or not), for adverbs: cf. e.g. *τοῦ λοιποῦ* (Hm. as above; 485
van Marle, florileg. p. 232 sq.), *πεζῇ*, *πάντη*, *καταμόνας*, *κατ᾽ ἰδίαν*, *ἰδίᾳ*, *καθόλου*, *εἰς κενόν*, and the Lexicons under the words. Instead of *κατὰ ἑκούσιον* Philem. 14 (Num. xv. 3) *ἑκουσίως*, *ἑκουσίᾳ* or *ἐξ ἑκουσίας* is more common in Greek. It is not necessary to speak of genuine Greek compounds, such as *παραχρῆμα*; on the other hand, in conformity with the genius of the Hebrew-Aramaic tongue, abstract substantives with prepositions, instead of adverbial forms actually existing, are more frequent than in Greek authors: e.g. *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ* Matt. xxii. 16, *ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας* Luke xxii. 59 (for *ἀληθῶς*), *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* Acts xvii. 31 for *δικαίως*, see above, § 51. In 2 Cor. iv. 16 *ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ*, as a circumlocution for the adverb *daily* (*καθ᾽ ἡμέραν* or *τὸ καθ᾽ ἡμέραν*, common in the N. T.), would be without example in the N. T. cf. יום יום, see Vorst, Hebr. 307 sq.; Ewald, kr. Gr. 638.[2] Probably, however, Paul designedly used the expression *day by day*, to indicate the progress of *ἀνακαινοῦσθαι*; whereas *καθ᾽ (ἑκάστην) ἡμέραν ἀνακαινοῦται* might be taken also in another sense. Further, we find an analogous con-

[1] However, what *Hm.* Eurip. Hel. p. 30 sq. says in elucidation of this use of neuters, deserves consideration.

[2] Cf. *ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* Georg. Phrantz. 4, 4, p. 356.

struction (though only in a local sense) in Mark vi. 39 ἐπέταξεν ἀνακλῖναι πάντας συμπόσια συμπόσια *catervatim*, (cf. Exod. viii. 14,) vs. 40 ἀνέπεσον πρασιαὶ πρασιαί *areolatim*, see § 37, 3. These words are strictly in apposition, cf. Luke ix. 14. What Georgi in his Vindic. p. 340 has collected is of another sort.

412 6th ed. When a simple accusative of a noun (substantive) is used adverbially, this use arises strictly from an abbreviated construction (Hm. Vig. 883). Besides the well-known χάριν, under this head come

a. τὴν ἀρχήν *throughout, altogether* (Vig. 723), which is probably so to be taken also in Jno. viii. 25 (see Lücke's careful examination of the passage): *altogether what I also say unto you* (I am entirely what in my discourses I profess to be). The context furnishes no ground whatever for preferring the interrogative to the categoric interpretation; Meyer's exposition is complicated, and appears to me least satisfactory of all.

b. ἀκμήν used in later Greek for ἔτι, as in Matt. xv. 16; see Lob. Phryn. 123 sq.

Adverbs may be joined not only to verbs, but also to nouns, as in 1 Cor. 433 7th ed. xii. 31 καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι, see no. 2, and 1 Cor. vii. 35 πρὸς τὸ εὐπάρεδρον τῷ κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως.

2. The adverbial notion is sometimes expressed concretely as adjectival, and subjoined to the substantive (Mtth. 1001; Kühner 486 II. 382). This takes place not only when it is to the substantive (not to the verb) that a predicate (logically) belongs (though in German an adverb is used),[1] but also where such reference to the substantive appears to be more favorable to perspicuity:[2] Acts xiv. 10 ἀνάστηθι ἐπὶ τοὺς πόδας σου ὀρθός, Mark iv. 28 αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, Acts xii. 10 (Iliad. 5, 749), Rom. x. 19 πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς λέγει (*as the first*), 1 Tim. ii. 13; Jno. xx. 4 etc.;[3] Luke

[1] So Jno. iv. 18 τοῦτο ἀληθὲς εἴρηκας *this hast thou spoken as* (something) *true*, hoc verum dixisti. On the other hand, τ. ἀληθῶς εἴρ. (which *Kühnöl* demands) would be ambiguous. Cf. Xen. vectig. 1, 2 ὅπως δὲ γνωσθῇ, ὅτι ἀληθὲς τοῦτο λέγω, Demosth. Halon. 34 b. τοῦτό γε ἀληθὲς λέγουσιν.

[2] Cf. especially *Bremi*, Exc. 2, ad Lys. 449 sq., *Mehlhorn*, de adjectivor. pro adverbio positor. ratione et usu. Glogav. 1828. See also *Vechner*, Hellenol. 215 sqq.; *Zumpt*, lat. Gramm. §§ 682, 686; *Kritz*, Sall. I. 125; II. 131, 216. In Latin this form of expression is in general still more prevalent. *Eichhorn* (Einleit. ins N. T. II. 261) makes an erroneous application of the rule in supposing that Jno. xiii. 34 ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι can signify, *anew* (καινῶς) *will I give you the commandment*. But in that case John must at least have written (ταύτην) τὴν ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι. Even the position of the words precludes taking μόνον adverbially in Jno. v. 44; see Lücke.

[3] Ordinal adjectives are used for adverbs only when *first, second*, etc. refer to the person; that is, when something is expressed which the person did *before* all other persons (was the first to do); but when the person is represented as doing a *first* act, in distinction from other subsequent acts of the same person, the adverb must be used. Cf. also *Kritz*, Sallust. II. 174.

xxi. 34 μήποτε ἐπιστῇ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη (var. αἰφνιδίως), Acts xxviii. 13 δευτεραῖοι ἤλθομεν εἰς Ποτιόλους, 1 Cor. ix. 17 εἰ γὰρ ἑκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω ... εἰ δὲ ἄκων etc. Cf. also Luke v. 21; 1 Cor. ix. 6, etc. With *these* adjectives the construction described is frequent, not to say predominant, in Greek authors (cf. in regard to αὐτόματος Her. 2, 66; Lucian. necyom. 1; Xen. An. 5, 7, 3; 4, 3, 8; Cyr. 1, 4, 13; Hell. 5, 1, 14; Dion. H. 1, 139; Wetst. I. 569, in regard to πρῶτος Xen. An. 2, 3, 19; Cyr. 1, 4, 2; Paus. 6, 4, 2; Charit. 2, 2, as to δευτερ. Her. 6, 106; Xen. Cyr. 5, 2, 2; Arrian. Al. 5, 22, 4; Wetst. II. 654, as to αἰφνίδιος Thuc. 6, 49; 8, 28, *subitus* irrupit Tac. hist. 3, 47); yet with other 413
adjectives not uncommon: Xen. Cyr. 5, 3, 55 αὐτὸς παρελαύνων 6th ed.
τὸν ἵππον ... ἥσυχος κατεθεᾶτο etc. 6, 1, 45 εὖ οἶδ', ὅτι ἄσμενος ἂν πρὸς ἄνδρα ... ἀπαλλαγήσεται (Demosth. Zenoth. 576 b.; 2 Macc. x. 33; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 48; see, on the other hand, Acts xxi. 17), 7, 5, 49 εἰ ταῦτα πρόθυμός σοι συλλάβοιμι (var.), 4, 2, 11 ἐθελούσιοι ἐξιόντες, Dio Chr. 40, 495 πυκνοὶ βαδίζοντες, Isocr. ep. 8 τελευτῶν (*at last, finally*) ὑπεσχόμην, cf. Palair. 214; Valcken. Her. 8, 130; Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. 156; Krü. 210 f.

How far it is correct to say that adjectives are used instead of adverbs 434
is obvious from the preceding observations. To suppose, also, that adverbs 7th ed.
are used instead of adjectives is a mistake (Ast,[1] Plat. polit. p. 271), as 487
in Matt. i. 18 ἡ γένεσις οὕτως ἦν, xix. 10 εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (LXX. Rom. iv. 18) 1 Pet. ii. 15; 1 Thess. ii. 10 ὡς ὁσίως κ. δικαίως καὶ ἀμέμπτως ὑμῖν ἐγενήθημεν, vs. 13; Rom. ix. 20 τί με ἐποίησας οὕτως; In the first of these passages εἶναι is not the simple copula (as in αὕτη or τοιοῦτό ἐστι), but denotes to *be of a certain condition or character, stand*, comparatum esse.[2] In Rom. ix. 20 οὕτως denotes the manner of ποιεῖν, the consequence of which is his being now the person that he is. Cf. Bremi, Aesch. Ctesiph. p. 278; Bhdy. S. 337 f.; Hm. Soph. Antig. 633; Wex, Antig. I. 206; Mehlhorn in the allg. Lit.-Zeit. 1833. Ergzbl. no. 108; Lob. Paralip. p. 151; as to Lat. Kritz, Sallust. Cat. p. 306 sq. Likewise in 1 Cor. vii. 7 ἕκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα, ὃς μὲν οὕτως, ὃς δὲ οὕτως the adverbs are in place: *each has his own* (peculiar) *gift, one after this manner, another after that.*

A closer approximation to adjectives is found

a. In certain local adverbs, such as ἐγγὺς εἶναι, χωρίς τινος εἶναι Eph. ii. 12, πόρρω εἶναι Luke xiv. 32 (Krü. 244).

[1] His article in the Landshuter Zeitschr. f. Wissensch. und Kunst III. II. 133 ff. I have not had an opportunity of comparing.

[2] In Jno. vi. 55 there is a variant. Recent editors have preferred ἀληθής, see *Lücke*; who, however, ably combats at the same time the opinion that ἀληθῶς and ἀληθής are synonymous.

b. In adverbs of degree annexed to substantives (ὤν being understood); as, μάλα στρατηγός Xen. Hell. 6, 2, 39, see Bhdy. 338. Usually they are placed before the noun, but sometimes after it. Even ancient expositors thus understood 1 Cor. xii. 31 καὶ ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι: *a super-eminent (more excellent) way.* Such an adverbial adjunct is placed after the noun in 1 Cor. viii. 7 τῇ συνειδήσει ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου, Phil. i. 26; 2 Pet. ii. 3, probably also in 2 Cor. xi. 23; see Mey.

3. The adverbial notion of *intensity* is not unfrequently expressed by joining to a verb a participle of the same verb (see § 45, 8), or a cognate noun in the Dative (Ablative): Luke xxii. 15 ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα *I have earnestly desired*, Jno. iii. 29 χαρᾷ χαίρει *impense laetatur*, Acts iv. 17 ἀπειλῇ ἀπειλησώμεθα *let us straitly threaten*, v. 28 παραγγελίᾳ παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν, xxiii. 14 ἀναθέματι
414 ἀνεθεματίσαμεν *we have bound ourselves under a great curse*, Jas.
6th ed. v. 17, from Sept. Matt. xiii. 14 (Isa. vi. 9); Matt. xv. 4 θανάτῳ τελευτάτω (Exod. xxi. 15). This form of expression is of frequent occurrence in the Sept. and the Apocr., and is there an imitation of the Hebrew Infinitive absolute, cf. Isa. xxx. 19; lxvi. 10; Deut.
488 vii. 26; Exod. xxi. 20; Josh. xxiv. 10; 1 Sam. xii. 25; xiv. 39; Sir. xlviii. 11; Judith vi. 4 (Vorst, Hebr. p. 624 sq.); yet it is sometimes found in Greek authors also (Schaef. Soph. II. 313;
435 Ast, Plat. Epin. 586; Lob. Paralip. 524) e.g. Plat. symp. 195 b.
7th ed. φεύγων φυγῇ τὸ γῆρας,[1] Phaedr. 265 d. ἐμοὶ φαίνεται τὰ μὲν ἄλλα παιδιᾷ πεπαῖσθαι, Phot. cod. 80, 113 σπουδῇ σπουδάζειν, Soph. Oed. R. 65 ὕπνῳ εὕδοντα, Ael. 8, 15 νίκῃ ἐνίκησε.

Of a different nature are those passages in which the Dative of the noun is accompanied by an adjective (or any other adjunct); as, ταῖς μεγίσταις τιμαῖς ἐτίμησαν, ζημιούτω τῇ νομιζομένῃ ζημίᾳ (Schwarz as above). These coincide with the mode of expression explained in § 32, 2; cf. Xen. A. 4, 5, 33; Plut. Coriol. 3; Aristoph. Plut. 592; Aeschyl. Prom. 392; Hom. hymn. in Merc. 572. From the N. T. see 1 Pet. i. 8 ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ etc. Even the expression γάμῳ γεγαμηκώς in Demosth. Boeot. 639 a. has no connection with the construction in question; it means, as it were, *having espoused by marriage* i.e. living in lawful wedlock, as γαμεῖσθαι alone is applied also to concubinage. Even Xen. An. 4, 6, 25 οἱ πελτασταὶ δρόμῳ ἔθεον I would except, as δρόμος denotes a particular sort of rapid advance: *at a run, on the trot.* As to Soph. Oed. C. 1625 (1621), see Hm. in loc.

[1] *Lob.*, as above, shows that in Greek authors this form of expression is used only in a figurative sense, not in a physical, as in Jer. (xxvi.) xlvi. 5. Moreover, in Latin the well-known occidione occidere is analogous to this construction.

4. Certain adverbial notions the Greeks were accustomed to regard as *verbal;* accordingly, the verb which was to have been qualified by one of these notions, they made, in the form of an Infinitive or Participle, to depend on it as principal verb (Mtth. 1279 ff.; cf. Kritz, Sallust. 1, 89): Heb. xiii. 2 ἔλαθόν τινες ξενίσαντες they (escaped — their own — notice as entertaining) entertained *unconsciously*, *unawares* (Wetst. in loc.; cf. also Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 7, 3; Tob. xii. 13),[1] Acts xii. 16 ἐπέμενε κρούων he knocked *persistently* (Jno. viii. 7) cf. Lösner, obs. 203; Mark xiv. 8 προέλαβε μυρίσαι *antevertit ungere*, she anointed *beforehand* (Kypke in loc.; φθάνω also is sometimes used with the Inf. see Wyttenbach, Juliani orat. p. 181; cf. *rapere occupat* Horat. Od. 2, 12, 28), Matt. vi. 5 φιλοῦσι προσεύχεσθαι they love to pray (cf. Ael. 14, 37 φιλῶ τὰ ἀγάλματα . . . ὁρᾶν) Wetst. and Fr. in loc., Luke xxiii. 12, see Bornem. Whether θέλω also (ἐθέλω? Hm. 489
Soph. Philoct. p. 238) is used as a finite verb to denote the adverbial notion *gladly*, *with pleasure*, *cheerfully* (sponte), has lately been questioned, (that the Partic. of θέλω is so used is well known, cf. Mey. on Col. ii. 18).[2] And in fact Jno. viii. 44 τὰς ἐπιθυμίας 415
τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν must be rendered: *the lusts of* 6th ed.
your father ye will (*are resolved and inclined to*) *do* (carry into 436
effect), either in general (your hearts impel you to follow the will of 7th ed.
Satan) or because ye go about to kill me (vs. 40). The Plural here, which troubles de Wette, has already been explained by Lücke. In Jno. vi. 21, also, the interpretation given by Kühnöl and others is necessary only in case an attempt (for which there is no authority) is made to harmonize the narrative of this evangelist with that of Matt. and Mark. At the same time this must be admitted, that ἤθελον ποιῆσαι *they purposed*, *were inclined*, *to do* (Arist. polit. 6, 8) when from the context it is obvious that the sense is not confined to the mere act of will,[3] may signify *they did it designedly*, *spontaneously*, *gladly*, e.g. Isocr. Callim. 914 οἳ δυστυχησάσης τῆς πόλεως προκινδυνεύειν ὑμῶν ἠθέλησαν *who were willing to expose*

[1] Yet in Ael. 1, 7 οὗτοι, ὅταν αὐτοὺς λαθόντες ὑοσκυάμου φάγωσι, we find the construction which corresponds to German usage. The Inf. instead of the Part. after λανθάνειν occurs in *Leo*, Chronogr. p. 19.

[2] In 2 Pet. iii. 5 λανθάνει τοῦτο θέλοντας I prefer the rendering *latet eos hoc* (what follows) *volentes*, i.e. volentes ignorant, to the other: *latet eos* (what follows), *hoc* (what precedes) *volentes*, i.e. contendentes; since the former brings out more clearly the guilt of the mockers. In Col. ii. 18 also θέλων is not to be taken as an adverb.

[3] In Jno. vi. 21 the matter appears according to *John's* account not to have gone beyond a mere act of the will.

themselves to danger for you (and have proved their willingness by their deeds), who cheerfully encountered dangers in your cause (Xen. Cyr. 1, 1, 3). The phrase *ἐθέλουσι ποιεῖν*, however, when it does not indicate a mere act of the will, signifies according to the nature of the case: *they do willingly, cheerfully* (Demosth. Ol. 2 p. 6 a. *ὅταν μὲν ὑπ' εὐνοίας τὰ πράγματα συστῇ καὶ πᾶσι ταὐτὰ συμφέρει . . . καὶ συμπονεῖν καὶ φέρειν τὰς συμφορὰς καὶ μένειν ἐθέλουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι*), or *they do it of their own accord, spontaneously* (Xen. Hier. 7, 9 *ὅταν ἄνθρωποι ἄνδρα ἡγησάμενοι . . . ἱκανὸν . . . στεφανῶσι . . . καὶ δωρεῖσθαι ἐθέλωσι*).[1] Cf. besides Stallb. Plat. symp. p. 56, and Gorg. p. 36; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 28. According to this, Mark xii. 38; Luke xx. 46 *τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς who wish to go about* i.e. who love to go about, would not be bad Greek (though *τῶν φιλούντων περ.* would be preferable); yet this expression is perhaps to be referred pri-
490 marily to the Hebraistic *θέλειν τι delectari re*, as in Mark *θέλειν* is immediately followed by the Accusative *ἀσπασμούς* as its object.

5. In Hebrew, adverbial notions are to a still greater extent regarded as verbal; since in that language they not only are grammatically construed with the verb (which shows that the two are essentially connected), as in יִסֵּם לְשַׁלַּח i.e. *he sent again*, which is imitated in Luke xx. 11 f. *προσέθετο πέμψαι* (but in Mark
416 xii. 4 we find *καὶ πάλιν ἀπέστειλεν*), Acts xii. 3 *προσέθετο συλλα-*
6th ed. *βεῖν καὶ Πέτρον besides he apprehended Peter also*, Mark xiv. 25 var. (thus frequently in Sept. *προστιθέναι* and Mid. *προστίθεσθαι*
437 Gen. iv. 2; xi. 6; Exod. x. 28; xiv. 13; Deut. iii. 26; xviii. 16;
7th ed. Josh. vii. 12, etc., likewise with Inf. Pass. Judges xiii. 21), but also both are used as finite verbs and joined together by *and: he does much and weeps* (Ewald 631).[2] This last construction has been retained in particular phrases through all periods of the language; whereas in other cases this mode of expression (as it were a *ἓν διὰ δυοῖν* with verbs) passes over perceptibly into the other, which becomes predominant. In the N. T. also it was thought that instances of that former and more simple construction were to be

[1] Cf. also Orig. c. Marcion. p. 35 *Wetst. τὰ δικαίως ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς εἰρημένα βούλει ἀδίκως νοεῖν thou art inclined to understand*, understandest designedly.

[2] The Sept. reproduce verbatim only a few of these Hebrew constructions, e.g. Judg. xiii. 10 *ἐτάχυνεν ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἔδραμε*, 1 Sam. xxv. 42; Ps. cv. 13; Dan. x. 18; Hos. i. 6. Cf. on the other hand, Gen. xxvi. 18; xxx. 31; Job xix. 3; Ps. xxxii. 3. The phrase וַיֹּסֶף is also rendered in the Sept. by the Part.: Gen. xxxviii. 5 *προσθεῖσα ἔτι ἔτεκεν υἱόν* etc., xxv. 1 *προσθέμενος Ἀβραὰμ ἔλαβε γυναῖκα*, Job xxix. 1; xxxvi. 1. It occurs once also in Luke xix. 11. Besides, cf. *Thiersch* de Pentat. alex. p. 177.

found,[1] as Rom. x. 20 *ἀποτολμᾷ καὶ λέγει speaks out boldly*, Luke vi. 48 *ἔσκαψε καὶ ἐβάθυνε he dug deep* (Schott), Col. ii. 5 *χαίρων καὶ βλέπων seeing with joy* (Beng. and Schott) etc. But in many passages referred to this head this explanation is quite inadmissible, — as in 2 Cor. ix. 9 *ἐσκόρπισεν, ἔδωκε τοῖς πένησιν* which must be rendered: *he dispersed abroad, he gave to the poor* (Ps. cxii. 9), — in others it is unnecessary, as in Luke vi. 48 *he dug and deepened* (crescit oratio, Beza); Jno. viii. 59 *ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ* (BCrus.) means: *he hid himself and went forth* i.e. either withdrew from their sight, rendered himself invisible (according to which a miraculous *ἀφανισμός* of Christ is narrated), or he concealed himself and went (soon after) away (Lücke, Mey.). The narrator might easily from his point of view combine thus, and connect by *καί*, two events not precisely simultaneous, yet following one another in rapid succession. Perhaps we should prefer, with Bengel, the first of the two explanations given, as 491
the one more in accordance with the character of *this* evangelist, and in fact established if the words *διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν* are genuine. In Acts xv. 16 the word *ἀναστρέψω* has nothing corresponding to it either in the Sept. or in the Hebrew (Amos ix. 11); probably to the apostle as he makes the quotation it means, (to him) *I will turn* (*myself*) *again* (as also שׁוּב in many passages of the O. T. must be taken so by itself, e.g. Jer. xii. 15 אָשׁוּב וְרִחַמְתִּים *I will return* — to them, antithetic to Jehovah's turning away from them — *and have mercy on them;* Sept. *ἀναστρέψω καὶ ἐλεήσω αὐτούς*), as *iterum* is already contained in the compounds *ἀνοικοδομήσω, ἀνορθώσω*. Likewise in Matt. xviii. 3 *ἐὰν μὴ στραφῆτε καὶ γένησθε* etc. and Acts vii. 42 *ἔστρεψεν ὁ θεὸς καὶ παρέδωκε* this verb appears independently: *to turn* i.e. according to the connection, respectively *turn about, repent*, and *turn away*. In Luke i. 68 the absolute construction of *ἐπεσκέψατο* (פָּקַד) 438
is obvious. The above passage from Rom. is more like the Latin 7th ed.
audet dicere; in which construction the idea of the first verb is 417
not conceived of as subordinate. Render: *he makes bold and* 6th ed.
says; ἀποτολ. indicates the frame of mind, *λέγειν* its result, the utterance of the mental state in the bold saying. In Col. as above Paul probably means to say two things:[2] in spirit I am present

[1] Every discriminating reader will perceive that the constructions from Xen., Plaut., and Persius, which *Kühnöl* on Luke vi. 48 has adduced as analogous, are of a different nature.

[2] In the quotation by *Wetst.* from Joseph. bell. jud. 3, 10, 2 the Codd. read *χαίρω καὶ βλέπων* or simply *βλέπων*.

with you, *rejoicing* (over you, *σὺν ὑμῖν*) *and beholding your order* etc. To the general statement is annexed one that is special. It is also possible that in *βλέπων* etc. the ground of the joy is subjoined, and *καί* is to be rendered *namely, that is.* As, however, the *rejoicing* is something caused by *βλέπειν*, the adverbial notion expressed independently by a finite verb could in no event *precede* the principal notion;[1] nor could such a form of expression be supported, on careful consideration, by Hebrew analogy.[2] Jas. iv. 2 *φονεύετε καὶ ζηλοῦτε* does not mean: *ye envy even to the death*
492 (Schott), *mortally*,[3] but as Stolz renders it, *ye kill and envy;* see Kern in loc. In Rev. iii. 19 the two verbal notions can easily be taken each by itself. Others, even Züllig, find here a hysteron-proteron; Hengstenberg on the passage is right.

Against the rendering of Mark x. 21 *ἠγάπησεν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ blande* eum compellavit (also Schott), see Mey. in loc.

439 6. As prepositions without a case are sometimes used as adverbs
7th ed. (see § 50, note 2, p. 423), so on the other hand, and still more
418 frequently, adverbs (especially of place and time) are connected
6th ed. with cases: as *ἅμα* (even in Her. 6, 118 *ἅμα τῷ στρατῷ*) which in later Greek became almost a preposition (*ἅμα αὐτοῖς* Matt. xiii. 29 equivalent to *σὺν αὐτοῖς*, cf. Lucian. Asin. 41, 45; Polyb. 4, 48, 6 etc. see Klotz, Devar. II. 97 sq.), *ἕως* of time and space (Klotz II. 564, cf. *ἕως τούτου* — for which the Greeks use *ἄχρι*, *μέχρι*, or in a

[1] Where the adverbial idea is promoted grammatically to an independence which does not logically belong to it, it can maintain such independence only by following the principal verb; cf. Plut. Cleom. 18 *εἰσελθὼν καὶ βιασάμενος* equivalent to *βίᾳ εἰσελθών*.

[2] The Hebrew verbs which when placed before other finite verbs are taken adverbially, express either an idea considered independently, as Job xix. 3 *ye are not ashamed and ye deafen me,* or a general idea which is more precisely defined by one more special, as: *he made haste and ran to meet the Philistines; he turned back and dug* etc. In like manner 1 Sam. ii. 3; which poetic passage, however, cannot be used in explaining the prose of the N. T.

[3] *Gebser* gains nothing by appealing to Jas. i. 11 and iii. 14 in support of this interpretation. In i. 11 *ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος . . . καὶ ἐξήρανε* expresses the rapid scorching of the herbage more aptly than *ἀνατείλας ἐξήρανε*, cf. *veni vidi vici,* not veniens vidi, or veni vidensque vici. To rise and to scorch is one act; not, 'after he is risen, he sets about scorching.' It is precisely by expressing each of the moments by a finite verb that their rapid succession is more graphically represented. The second passage, iii. 14 *μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας*, I render (and *Wiesinger* concurs with me) *do not glory and lie against the truth; κατὰ τῆς ἀλ.* belongs properly to *κατακαυχᾶσθαι* (Rom. xi. 18). But the apostle to explain *κατακ.* thrusts in forthwith a stronger expression. By resolving it into *μὴ κατακαυχώμενοι ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθ.* we gain only the tautology *κατὰ τ. ἀλ. ψεύδεσθαι,* while the *κατά* in *κατακαυχ.* is wholly neglected.

local sense ἕως εἰς, ἕως ἐπί; yet cf. Diod. S. 1, 27 ἕως ὠκεανοῦ), also with names of persons (*even unto, to* Luke iv. 42; Acts ix. 38; cf. Lament. iii. 39), χωρίς (Jno. xv. 5 *separated from*, μὴ μένοντες ἐν ἐμοί vs. 4, cf. Xen. C. 6, 1, 7; Polyb. 3, 103, 8, then very frequently *without* and *besides*), πλησίον Jno. iv. 5 with Gen., as in Sept. cf. Xen. Mem. 1, 4, 6; Aeschin. dial. 3, 3 (in Greek authors also with Dat.), but παραπλησίον Phil. ii. 27 with Dat. (with very slight variation of Codd.), ἐγγύς with Gen. Jno. iii. 23; vi. 19; xi. 18 etc. and with Dat. Acts ix. 38; xxvii. 8, ὀψέ with Gen. Matt. xxviii. 1, ἔμπροσθεν with Gen., ὀπίσω (exclusively Hellenistic), ὄπισθεν with Gen., ὑπερέκεινα and ἔλαττον ditto, and also ἔσω and ἔξω with Gen. Several of these are so frequently construed with a case, that they may be taken directly as prepositions; just as in ἕως, χωρίς, ἄχρι, μέχρι, the adverbial meaning is already perceptibly receding, and in ἄνευ (in the N. T.) has entirely disappeared. 493

Under this head comes also Phil. ii. 15 μέσον γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς (cf. Theophan. p. 530), which Lchm. and Tdf. have properly admitted into the text. But in Matt. xiv. 24 τὸ πλοῖον ἤδη μέσον τῆς θαλάσσης ἦν the word μέσον is an adjective: navis jam media maris erat, see Krebs in loc. In general, the use of adverbs with the Gen. in the N. T. diction appears very simple if we compare with it the far bolder constructions employed in the Greek of all periods, see Bhdy. 157 f.

Combinations such as ἕως ἄρτι, ἕως πότε, ἕως ὅτου, ἕως πρωΐ, ἕως ἔξω, ἕως κάτω and the like, are, indeed, especially common in later prose authors (in Sept. cf. ἕως τότε Neh. ii. 16, ἕως τίνος, ἕως οὗ Gen. xxvi. 13), but some such had already been sanctioned by earlier writers, Bhdy. 196; Krü. 266 f. As to adverbs with the article instead of nouns, see § 18, 3 p. 109.

7. Adverbs of place, even when not in relative clauses (§ 23, 2), are (originally by force of an attraction, Hm. Vig. 790, ad Soph. Antig. 517; Wex, Antig. I. 107; Weber, Demosth. p. 446; Krüger, grammat. Untersuchungen III. 306 ff.) interchanged by good prose writers; particularly adverbs of rest are joined to verbs of motion when at the same time continuance in a place is to be expressed, Hm. as above, Bhdy. 350 (see above, on ἐν, § 50, 4) cf. Matt. ii. 22 ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν, xvii. 20; xxviii. 16. So in the later writers ἐκεῖ came to be used freely for ἐκεῖσε, ποῦ and ὅπου for ποῖ and ὅποι, οὗ for *whither*. They are thus used in the Sept. and even in the N. T. (where e.g. ὅποι never occurs); as, 440
Jno. xviii. 3 ὁ Ἰούδας ... ἔρχεται ἐκεῖ μετὰ φανῶν καὶ λαμπάδων 7th ed.

419 (Arrian. Epict. 24, 113),[1] Rom. xv. 24 ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι
1th ed. ἐκεῖ (to Spain), Jno. vii. 35; iii. 8 (πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει), viii. 14; xi. 8; Luke xxiv. 28; Jas. iii. 4; Rev. xiv. 4, etc. This is an abuse easily to be explained in the language of conversation (in ὧδε and ἐνθάδε, ἐνταυθοῖ, the meanings *hic* and *huc* coalesced still earlier, Krü. 268), and which ought not to be denied in the written language of the N. T.[2]

With respect to other adverbs of place, not only does ἔσω stand
494 for *within* (ἔνδον does not occur in the N. T.) Jno. xx. 26; Acts v. 23 (Ezek. ix. 6; Lev. x. 18), but also ἐκεῖσε for ἐκεῖ Acts xxii. 5 ἄξων καὶ τοὺς ἐκεῖσε ὄντας (see Wetst. in loc., cf. especially οἱ ἐκεῖσε οἰκέοντες Hippocr. vict. san. 2, 2 p. 35, and the Index to Agathias, to Menander, and to Malal. ed. Bonn.). On the other hand, Acts xiv. 26 ὅθεν ἦσαν παραδεδομένοι τῇ χάριτι, as even Luther saw, is quite regular, cf. Mey. (and the emendation by Hemsterhuis, ἦεσαν, inadmissible in any case); and in Acts xxi. 3 ἐκεῖσε retains its meaning, as does ποῦ in Luke xii. 17. The adverbs ἔξωθεν, ἔσωθεν, κάτω, in prose usage, as is well known, represent both relations, *from without* and *without*, *downwards* and *beneath*, etc.

Further, how the usage of the later prose writers keeps pace with that of the N. T. may be seen from the collections of Lob. Phryn. p. 43 sq. 128; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 9. Cf. besides, Buttm. Philoct. p. 107; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 95 sqq.;[3] Schoem. Plutarch. Cleom. p. 186; Hartung, Casus S. 85 ff., also Kypke and Elsner on Matt. ii. 22.

That adverbs of place (relat.) are also used with reference to *persons* is well known, cf. Rev. ii. 13 παρ' ὑμῖν, ὅπου ὁ σατὰν.

[1] Her. 1, 121 ἐλθὼν ἐκεῖ plainly signifies: *having arrived there* (cf. the preceding ἴθι χαίρων ἐς Πέρσας), and so might ἔρχεσθαι in Jno. xviii. 3 perhaps be rendered. Heb. vi. 20 ὅπου πρόδρομος εἰσῆλθε may mean, *where* entered; see *Böhme*, whom *Bleek* has not understood.

[2] Many passages, to be sure, have been referred to this head which are of another sort, e.g. Matt. xxvi. 36; Luke xii. 17, 18. Here ἐκεῖ and οὗ certainly mean: *there, where*. Not so Luke x. 1, where *Hölemann's* translation *ubi iter facere in animo erat* is false because ἔρχεσθαι does not mean *iter facere*. Cf. *Hm.* Soph. Antig. p. 106.

[3] It is, indeed, not to be overlooked that forms such as ποῦ, ποῖ, also ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖσε, might be easily exchanged by transcribers, as actually happens often in MSS. of Greek authors (*Schaef.* Eurip. Hec. 1062). Nevertheless, in the case of the N. T. the number of such variations noted is extremely small. Also corrections, as Acts xxii. 5 ἐκεῖ, very rarely occur, since the readers were too much accustomed to such use of these adverbs to take offence at it. Besides, the old (Homeric) language coincides with the later prose in the interchange of local adverbs, while Attic prose keeps the forms more distinct.

κατοικεῖ Vechner, hellenol. p. 234. Besides, we find them used occasionally with a loose reference, Jno. xx. 19 τ. θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταί *there* (of the chamber) *where*, Mark ii. 4; cf. Matt. ii. 9 (Krü. 268).

§ 55. NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

441 7th ed.

1. The Greek language has, as is well known, two orders of 420 6th ed.
negatives, οὐ, οὔτε, οὐκέτι (οὐδείς) etc., and μή, μήτε, μηκέτι (μηδείς) etc. The distinction between the two has been most fully unfolded 495
by Hermann (ad Vig. p. 804 ff.; cf. Mtth. II. 1437 ff; Mdv. 235 ff.). *Οὐ*, for instance, is used when something is denied in plain terms and directly (as a matter of fact); *μή*, where something is denied as mere matter of thought (according to supposition, and under conditions): the former is the *objective*, the latter the *subjective* negation.[1] And this distinction is in substance observed also in the N. T.;[2] as will be clear first of all,

[1] Cf. besides, *L. Richter*, de usu et discrim. particul. οὐ et μή. Crossen, 1831–1834, 3 Commentatt. 4to.; *F. Franke*, de particulis negantib. linguae gr. Rintel. 1832–1833, 2 Comment. 4to. (reviewed by *Benfey*, in n. Jahrb. f. Philol. XII. 147 ff.); *Bäumlein*, in d. Zeitschr. f. Alterthumswiss. 1847. nr. 97–99, and remarks, highly instructive on the general subject also, concerning particular uses of both forms of negation in *Hm.* Soph. Oed. R. 568; Ajac. 76; Philoct. 706; Eurip. Androm. 379; *Elmsley*, Eurip. Med. p. 155 Lips.; *Schaef.* Demosth. I. 225, 465, 587, 591; II. 266, 327, 481, 492, 568; III. 288, 299; IV. 258; V. 730; *Stallb.* Plat. Phaed. p. 43, 144. (The theory of *Hermann* is combated on the ground of *Thiersch's* principles by *Hartung*, Lehre von den griech. Partik. II. 73 ff., and he is followed by *Rost*, Gramm. 743; in the main, however, he at last agrees with *Herm.*, and the doubt through which he was led to his views has been solved by *Klotz*, Devar. II. 666. *G. F. Gayler's* essay, particular. gr. sermonis negantium accurata disputatio, Tubing. 1836. 8vo., is an industrious collection of examples, but is deficient in clearness.) On the difference between *non* and *haud* in Latin see *Franke* I. 7 sq., the review in Hall. L. Z. 1834. no. 145, and *Hand*, Tursell. III. 16 ff. (who at the same time explains οὐ as the qualitative, μή as the modal negation). The comparison of the Heb. אַל with μή (*Ewald*, 530) can be less perfectly carried through; precisely in the more delicate relations the correspondence fails.

[2] That the N. T. authors observed almost invariably this in itself delicate difference, is due not to their theoretical knowledge, but to the sense of propriety they acquired by much intercourse with those who spoke Greek; precisely as we also learn the sometimes conventional difference between the synonyms of our mother tongue. In particular instances, however, a foreigner might well be expected to err, since even *Plutarch* (*Schaef.* Demosth. III. 289; Plutarch. V. 6, 142, 475), *Lucian* (*Schaef.* Demosth. I. 529; *Schoemann*, Plutarch. Agis p. 93; *Fritzsche*, quaestion. Lucian. p. 44), *Pausan.* (*Franke*, I. 14), *Aelian* (*Jacobs*, Ael. anim. p. 187), cf. *Mdv.* 245; *Mtth.* 1444, are said to have sometimes interchanged the two negatives. Cf. also on ὅτι μή for ὅτι οὐ *Ellendt*, praef. ad Arrian. I. 24 sq. I would not, however, assert that in these passages grammatical acuteness might not repeatedly be able to discover the reason for οὐ or μή;

a. From the examination of a few passages in which the two negatives occur *together*. Jno. iii. 18 *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται,*
442 *ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν* etc. (cf. Hm. as
7th ed. above 805); *κρίνεσθαι* is denied as matter of fact by *οὐ*, i.e. it is asserted that in fact a judgment does not take place. The second *πιστεύων*, however, is negatived by the particle *μή* merely as a
496 supposed case, for *ὁ μὴ πιστ.* means, *who* (ever) *does not believe*,
421 *if one does not believe* (*ὁ οὐ πιστεύων* would indicate a definite in-
6th ed. dividual who does not believe); hence follows also *ὅτι μὴ πεπίστ.*, since a case is merely supposed (quod non crediderit). This usage is not contradicted by 1 Jno. v. 10 *ὁ μὴ πιστεύων τῷ θεῷ ψεύστην πεποίηκεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν* etc. Here the apostle in the last words passes suddenly from the mere supposition (*ὁ μὴ πιστ.*) to the matter of fact: the *μὴ πιστεύειν* had already begun, and John pictures to himself now an actual unbeliever.

Mark xii. 14 *ἔξεστι κῆνσον . . . δοῦναι ἢ οὔ; δῶμεν, ἢ μὴ δῶμεν;* where, in the first instance, inquiry is made as to the objective reason for paying tribute; in the second, a subjective principle is expressed: *are* (ought) we to give etc. Cf. Hm. Vig. 806, on Aristoph. Thesmoph. 19, and Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 270.

Eph. v. 15 *βλέπετε πῶς ἀκριβῶς περιπατεῖτε, μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί*; the *μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι* etc. is the direct explanation of *πῶς*, and like that dependent on *βλέπετε*,—hence the subjective negation.

2 Cor. x. 14 *οὐ γάρ, ὡς μὴ ἐφικνούμενοι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὑπερεκτείνομεν ἑαυτούς we do not overstretch ourselves* (objectively negatived), *as though we had not reached to you*, a mere supposition; in point of fact it is not so. Cf., on the other hand, 1 Cor. ix. 26.

Rom. xi. 21 *εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται if God spared not* (matter of fact, he has in reality not spared them), *so* (*it is to be feared*) *lest he also spare not thee.* Here the apostle might have uttered the sentence categorically, *so will he also not spare thee;* but he prefers to give it a milder turn by using *μήπως*: lest perhaps *οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται* become true; and every apprehension is subjective (Rev. ix. 4). Cf. Plat. Phaed. 76 b. *φοβοῦμαι, μὴ αὔριον τηνικάδε οὐκέτι ᾖ ἀνθρώπων οὐδεὶς ἀξίως οἷός τε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι*, p. 84 b. *οὐδὲν δεινόν, μὴ φοβηθῇ, ὅπως μὴ . . . οὐδὲν ἔτι οὐδαμοῦ ᾖ*, Thuc. 2, 76; see Gayler pp. 427, 430.

while we must never forget that sometimes there is no stringent reason in favor of *οὐ* or *μή*, but either negative may be used according to the author's view of the case, *Hm.* Vig. 806.

1 Jno. v. 16 *ἐάν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον . . . πᾶσα ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστὶ καὶ ἔστιν ἁμαρτία οὐ πρὸς θάνατον* (in the former clause *μή* is used as following up a subjective observation and dependent on *ἐὰν ἴδῃ*, in the latter *οὐ*, since an objectively valid principle is asserted, an idea dogmatically real is laid down).

Jno. vi. 64 *εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες, οἳ οὐ πιστεύουσιν· ἤδει γὰρ . . . ὁ Ἰησ., τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες*, the former clause conveying a matter of fact, the second a supposition, *who they were that would not believe*, qui essent, qui non crederent. Cf. besides Rom. v. 13; 497
Jno. v. 23; xiv. 24; xv. 24; Acts iv. 20; x. 14; xxv. 17 f; 1 Jno. iv. 8; v. 12; 3 Jno. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 10; Gal. iv. 8; 2 Cor. ii. 13; 443
Heb. iv. 2, 15.[1] 7th ed.

b. But the same result which these passages give follows also 422
from those in which *μή* occurs alone: Matt. xxii. 25 *μὴ ἔχων* 6th ed.
σπέρμα ἀφῆκε τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ, where *μὴ ἔχων* is used with reference to the law that made this provision (*ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων* etc. vs. 24): not having, he left behind etc., as one not having in the sense of the law, he left etc. (*οὐκ ἔχων* would exhibit the not having as if narrating something purely a matter of fact); in Mark xii. 20 we find in the narrative form *οὐκ ἀφῆκε σπέρμα*. Col. i. 23 *εἴγε ἐπιμένετε τῇ πίστει . . . καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλπ.*, where the *not being moved away* (in a proposition beginning with *εἴγε*) is put as a condition, consequently as something only supposed. 2 Thess. i. 8 *διδόντος ἐκδίκησιν τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι θεὸν καὶ τοῖς μὴ ὑπακούουσι τῷ εὐαγγ.*; the statement here is general: such as know not God, whoever they are, wherever such are to be found (consequently a supposition), cf. ii. 12. Rom. xiv. 21 *καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα* (the not eating as something supposed: *if any one eat not; τὸ οὐ φαγεῖν* would represent the not

[1] Passages from Greek authors in which *οὐ* and *μή* appear together in the same main proposition, with more or less obvious difference, are e.g. Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 1, 3, 68 *ταῦτα οὐκ ἀπολογουμένου ἦν, ἀλλὰ κακοῖς ἐπιπληροῦντος κακὰ καὶ μηκέτι μετρίως, ἀλλὰ ἄρδην ἐπισπωμένου τὰς ἀπορίας*, 2, 60 *λεκτέον, ὡς εἰ μηδέν ἐστι ῥητορικῆς τέλος, οὐδέν ἐστι ῥητορική* (2, 107), 2, 110; hypotyp. 3, 1, 2; Lucian. catapl. 15 *ἐγὼ ἅτε μηδὲν ἔχων ἐνέχυρον ἐν τῷ βίῳ, οὐκ ἀγρόν, οὐ συνοικίαν, οὐ χρυσόν* etc. Soph. Antig. 686 *οὔτ' ἂν δυναίμην, μήτ' ἐπισταίμην λέγειν*, Philoct. 1048; Demosth. Callicl. 736 b.; pac. 23 a.; Phorm. 604 a.; Xen. C. 2, 4, 27; Aristot. polit. 6, 8; rhet. 1, 11, 31; 2, 2, and 15; Lucian. dial. mort. 16, 2; adv. indoct. 5; Strabo 3, 138; 15, 712; Himer. oratt. 23, 18; Plutarch. Pompej. 23; apophth. p. 183 f.; Aelian. anim. 5, 28; Joseph. Antt. 16, 9, 3. Cf. besides, *Gayler* p. 291. From the Fathers, cf. Origen c. Marc. p. 26 *Wetst.*; from the apocrypha, Acta apocr. p. 107. Particularly noteworthy is Agath. 2, 23 *ἐφ' ὅτῳ ἂν σώματι μὴ θᾶττον καταπταῖεν οἱ ὄρνεις ἢ οἱ κύνες οὐκ αὐτίκα ἐπιφοιτῶντες διασπαράξαιεν* etc.

eating as something objective, — an actually existing practice it may be). Rom. xv. 1 *ὀφείλομεν δὲ ἡμεῖς . . . καὶ μὴ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκειν* (vs. 3 narratively: *καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν*). Hence, naturally, with the Optative when a mere wish is expressed (Franke I. 27), Mark xi. 14 *μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι* (yet some Codd. read here *φάγῃ*), 2 Tim. iv. 16; and in Imperative sentences, Rom. xiv. 1 *τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα τῇ πίστει προς-*
498 *λαμβάνεσθε, μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις διαλογισμῶν* (xii. 11); Phil. ii. 12, where some erroneously refer the words *μὴ ὡς ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ* etc. to *ὑπηκούσατε*, in which case *οὐ* would have been indispensable.

In accordance with the difference above defined, *μή* in general will express the weaker (cf. also Hm. Philoct. 706), and *οὐ*, as categorical, the stronger negation. Nevertheless *μή* is also at times more emphatic than *οὐ* (Hm. Soph. Antig. 691), inasmuch as, if
444 (even) the supposition is denied, more is expressed than if the
7th ed. actual existence of a thing (as a fact) is denied. See under no. 5. In like manner is the Latin *haud* sometimes the stronger, sometimes the weaker negation, Franke I. 7; cf. Hand, Tursell. III. 20.

Where *οὐ* belongs to a single word (verb) to which in the language there is a negative directly antagonistic, it coalesces with that word and expresses this exactly contrary idea, as *οὐκ ἐᾶν to prevent* Acts xvi. 7, *οὐ*
423 *θέλειν nolle* 1 Cor. x. 1. See Franke I. 9 sq., cf. under no. 6. *Οὐ* combined
6th ed. with nouns into one idea obliterates their meaning altogether: Rom. x. 19 *παραζηλώσω ὑμᾶς ἐπ᾽ οὐκ ἔθνει over a no-nation*, ix. 25 *καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην*, 1 Pet. ii. 10 — (all quotations from O. T.); cf. Thuc. 1, 137 *ἡ οὐ διάλυσις the not breaking* (the bridge had not been broken), 5, 50 *ἡ οὐκ ἐξουσία*, Eurip. Hippol. 196 *οὐκ ἀπόδειξις*, see Monk in loc.; Sturz, ind. ad Dion. Cass. p. 245; Fr. Rom. II. 424. How this combination differs from that with *μή* (*ἡ μὴ διάλυσις*), see Franke, as above, I. 9. Numerous examples of both in Gayler p. 16 sqq.

The simple, accented, *οὔ no* (Matt. v. 37; Jas. v. 12; 2 Cor. i. 17 f.) occurs in answer to a question only in Matt. xiii. 29; Jno. i. 21, (for instances from Greek writers, see Gayler p. 161); the fuller form *οὐκ ἔγωγε* would have been more usual.

2. Let us consider now those cases, the most frequent of all, in which a negation is expressed by *μή*; this takes place:

a. In (wishes) commands, resolutions, encouragements, and that not only with verbs of the sort, that is to say Imperatives and Subjunctives, Matt. vii. 1 *μὴ κρίνετε*, Gal. v. 26 *μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι*, 2 Thess. iii. 10, see § 56, 1, but also with words which are

considered as integral parts of the command, etc., 1 Pet. v. 2 *ποιμάνατε ... μὴ ἀναγκαστῶς*, 1 Pet. i. 13 f.; 1 Tim. v. 9; Luke vi. 35; 1 Cor. v. 8; Rom. xiii. 13; Phil. ii. 4, 12; Heb. x. 25; Acts x. 20.

b. In telic clauses, with *ἵνα* Matt. vii. 1; xvi. 20; Rom. xi. 25; Eph. ii. 9; Heb. xii. 3; Mark v. 43; 2 Cor. v. 15; vii. 9; Eph. 499
iv. 14, or *ὅπως* Luke xvi. 26; 1 Cor. i. 29; Matt. vi. 18; Acts viii. 24; xx. 16. So also with single words of such clauses, Rom. viii. 4; Eph. ii. 12 [?]; Phil. i. 27 f.; iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. xii. 27.

c. In conditional sentences (Hm. Vig. 805), with *εἰ* Jno. xv. 22 *εἰ μὴ ἦλθον, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχοσαν*, xviii. 30 *εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακὸν ποιῶν, οὐκ ἄν σοι παρεδώκαμεν*, Matt. xxiv. 22; Acts xxvi. 32; Rom. vii. 7; Jno. ix. 33, and with *ἐάν* Matt. v. 20; xii. 29; Rom. x. 15; 2 Tim. ii. 5, not only with reference to the whole proposition, but also with single words which are considered as conditional, 1 Tim. v. 21; Tit. i. 6 *εἴ τις ἐστὶν ἀνέγκλητος ... μὴ ἐν κατηγορίᾳ ἀσωτίας*, ii. 8; Jas. i. 4, 26.

In all these cases the necessity of the subjective negation is clear; for every condition, design, purpose, command, falls within the province of what is merely conceived of.

In conditional sentences *οὐ* occurs not infrequently; in the N. T. 445
pretty often, in the older writers with logical necessity only where 7th ed.
but a single word of the conditional sentence (hardly the *verb* merely Krü. 271) is negatived, so that the negation coalesces with this word into a single idea, Hm. Vig. 833; Eurip. Med. p. 344; Soph. Oed. C. 596; Schaef. Plut. IV. 396[1]; Mehlhorn, Anacr. p. 139; Bremi, Lys. p. 111; Schoemann, Isae. p. 324 sq.; e.g. 424
Soph. Aj. 1131 *εἰ τοὺς θανόντας οὐκ ἐᾷς θάπτειν if thou hinderest* 6th ed.
(Iliad. 4, 55), Lys. Agor. 62 *εἰ μὲν οὐ πολλοὶ* (i.e. *ὀλίγοι*) *ἦσαν*, Thuc. 3, 55 *εἰ ἀποστῆναι Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἠθελήσαμεν*, Her. 6, 9. Cf. Gayl. p. 99 sqq.; Mtth. 1440; Krü. 271. (On the analogous *ὅπως οὐ* see Held, Plut. Timol. 357.) According to this there is nothing strange in Matt. xxvi. 42; Luke xvi. 31; Jno. v. 47; Rom. viii. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 10, 14; 1 Tim. iii. 5; v. 8; Rev. xx. 15, etc., and as little in 2 Cor. xii. 11 *εἰ καὶ οὐδέν εἰμι*.

On the other hand, Lipsius (de modor. in N. T. usu p. 26 sqq.) has adduced a number of other passages, which contradict the

[1] *Schaef.* Demosth. III. 288: *οὐ* poni licet, quando negatio refertur ad sequentem vocem cum eaque sic coalescit, unam ut ambae notionem efficiant; *μή* ponitur, quando negatio pertinet ad particulam conditionalem. Cf. *Rost*, Gr. S. 745.

above canon, or appear to do so; since, indeed, generally in the N. T. *if not* is expressed more frequently by εἰ οὐ than by εἰ μή, which latter phrase most commonly signifies *except*.[1] We divide
500 these passages into four classes:

a) Such as have nothing to do with the question: Luke xii. 26 εἰ οὐδὲ ἐλάχιστον δύνασθε, τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε; for εἰ here is conditional only in appearance; in reality it is equivalent to ἐπεί, Krü. 271. Translate *if* (as is clear from the alleged cases), i.e. *since you cannot do even the least* etc. (hence always θαυμάζω εἰ οὐ cf. Kühner II. 406). So also Rom. xi. 21; Jno. iii. 12; v. 47; x. 35; Heb. xii. 25; 2 Pet. ii. 4; cf. Soph. Oed. Col. 596 εἰ θέλοντάς γ' οὐδὲ σοὶ φεύγειν καλόν σε, *quum te volunt recipere, ne tibi quidem decorum est exsulem esse*, and Aeschin. ep. 8 εἰ δὲ οὐδὲ σὺν ἐκείνῳ διέγνωκας ἐξιέναι etc., Sext. Empir. Math. 7, 434 εἰ οὐδ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ᾔδει etc. Xenoph. A. 7, 1, 29; Aesop. 23, 2, see Bhdy. 386; Franke, Demosth. p. 202; Gayl. 118; Hm. Aeschyl. II. 148.

b) Such as, when viewed more closely, are in unison with the above canon: not only 1 Cor. xi. 6 εἰ γὰρ οὐ κατακαλύπτεται γυνή, καὶ κειράσθω *if a woman is unveiled, she ought also to be shorn*, 2 Thess. iii. 10, but also Jno. x. 37 εἰ οὐ ποιῶ τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρός μου, μὴ πιστεύετέ μοι· εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ πιστεύητε, τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύσατε *if I omit the works of my Father* (and thus *withhold* from you the proofs of my divine mission) etc.; *but if I do them* etc., Jno. iii. 12; Rom. viii. 9; Rev. xx. 15; cf. Lys. accus. Agor.
446 76 ἐὰν μὲν οὖν φάσκῃ Φρύνιχον ἀποκτεῖναι, τούτων μέμνησθε . . . ἐὰν
7th ed. δ' οὐ φάσκῃ, ἔρεσθε αὐτόν etc. *but if he denies it*, Sext. Empir. Math. 2, 111 εἰ μὲν λήμματά τινα ἔχει . . . εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔχει etc. *but if he is destitute of them*, 9, 176 εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἔχει, φαῦλόν ἐστι τὸ θεῖον . . . εἰ δὲ ἔχει, ἔσται τι τοῦ θεοῦ κρεῖττον, hypotyp. 2, 5. 160. 175; Lucian. paras. 12; Galen. temper. 1, 3; Mr. Anton. 11, 18 p. 193 Mor. (cf. also Euseb. de die dom. p. 9 Jani). Nor is there anything to object against 1 Cor. xv. 13: εἰ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστι *if the resurrection of the dead is a chimera*, etc.; cf. in the preceding context πῶς λέγουσί τινες ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν; On vs. 16 cf. Philostr. Apoll. 4, 16, p. 154.

c) Cases in which the proposition with εἰ οὐ merely negatives
425 the idea which is expressed affirmatively in a corresponding propo-
6th ed. sition, without the οὐ coalescing with the negatived word into a

[1] εἰ οὐ and εἰ μή are well distinguished in a single sentence in Acta Thom. p. 57 ed. *Thilo*.

single opposed idea: 1 Cor. ix. 2 *εἰ ἄλλοις οὐκ εἰμὶ ἀπόστολος, ἀλλάγε ὑμῖν εἰμι*, si aliis non sum apostolus, vobis certe sum. Luke xi. 8, cf. xviii. 4. But even in such oppositions later writers use *εἰ οὐ*, e.g. Sext. Empir. Math. 11, 5 *εἰ μὲν ἀγαθόν ἐστιν, ἓν τῶν τριῶν γενήσεται, εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀγαθόν, ἤτοι κακόν ἐστιν, ἢ οὔτε κακόν ἐστιν οὔτε ἀγαθόν ἐστιν*, Diog. L. 2, 36 *εἰ μὲν γάρ τι τῶν προσόντων λέξειαν, διορθώσονται, εἰ δ' οὔ, οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, where the sense is 501
not: if, however, they *be silent* about it, but, if they do *not* say something useful,[1] cf. Judg. ix. 20; Judith v. 21; Demosth. epp. p. 125 a.; Basilic. II. 525, and Poppo Xen. Anab. p. 358.

d) Cases in which *οὐ* likewise antithetically denies, without, however, an express affirmative proposition preceding: Jas. ii. 11 *εἰ οὐ μοιχεύσεις* (with reference to the preceding *μὴ μοιχεύσῃς*), *φονεύσεις δέ, γέγονας παραβάτης νόμου if thou dost not commit adultery, yet if thou killest*,[2] i. 23; iii. 2; 1 Cor. xvi. 22 *εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἤτω ἀνάθεμα* (where the rendering, *if any one hateth the Lord*, would probably not represent the apostle's meaning); 2 Jno. 10 *εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδαχὴν οὐ φέρει*, Luke xiv. 26.

For the later prose writers, then, who in general use *εἰ οὐ* (as the stronger and more expressive form) much oftener than the older writers (who were rather frugal in its use), we may state the rule thus (cf. also Anton, Progr. de discrim. particul. *οὐ* et *μή*, Gorlic. 1823, 4to. p. 9): where *not* in a conditional proposition is emphatic,[3] *εἰ οὐ* (as in Latin *si non*) is used; but where *if not* stands without emphasis on the negation, *εἰ μή* (as in Latin *nisi*): 447
e.g. if thou dost *not* commit adultery (with reference to the pre- 7th ed.
ceding *μὴ μοιχ.*), if any man loveth *not* the Lord (as he ought), if I am *not* an apostle unto others, Jno. i. 25 if thou art *not* the Christ, cf. vs. 20. The emphasis is brought out by an antithesis, either open (1 Cor. ix. 2)[4] or concealed (1 Cor. xvi. 22). It lies, however, in the nature of the case that *οὐ* then negatives only a *part* of the conditional proposition, not the proposition itself.

[1] Macar. homil. 1, 10. Cf. also *ἐάν* Diog. L. 1, 105 *ἐὰν νέος ὢν τὸν οἶνον οὐ φέρῃς, γέρων γενόμενος ὕδωρ οἴσεις*.

[2] Equivalent to *εἰ οὐ μοιχεύων ἔσῃ, φονεύων δέ*, cf. Arrian. Epict. 1, 29, 35; 2, 11, 22. On the contrary, Thuc. 1, 32 *εἰ μὴ μετὰ κακίας, δόξης δὲ μᾶλλον ἁμαρτίᾳ ... ἐναντία τολμῶμεν*.

[3] *Mehlhorn*, as above, gives the rule: ubi simpliciter negatio affirmationi ita opponatur, ut negandi part. voce sit acuenda, semper *οὐ* poni, ubi contra verbum voce inprimis, notandum *μή* esse debere. Cf. also Poppo on Xen. Anab. as above.

[4] Cf. also e.g. Aesop. 7, 4 *εἰ οὐ σοὶ τοῦτο προσέφερεν, οὐκ ἂν ἡμῖν αὐτὸ συνεβούλευες* if it were not useful to *thee*, thou wouldst not advise *us* to it.

Ὥστε (Krü. p. 272 f.) of a consequence even when represented as mere matter of fact is used in the N. T. always with μή and the Infinitive, Matt. viii. 28; Mark i. 45; ii. 2; iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 7; 1 Thess. i. 8. Only in 2 Cor. iii. 7 is there a logical ground for it in the conditional proposition; Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 219.

426 After ὅτι and ἐπεί *because* (in direct discourse) οὐ follows regularly, Jno.
6th ed. viii. 20, 37; Rom. xi. 6; Luke i. 34; Bäumlein S. 773; ὅτι μή in con-
502 ditional discourse occurs in Jno. iii. 18. On the contrary, we have in Heb. ix. 17, in direct discourse, διαθήκη ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία, ἐπεὶ μήποτε ἰσχύει, ὅτε ζῇ ὁ διαθέμενος, which Böhme explains thus: μήποτε seems here to negative even the idea of ἰσχύειν; consequently in general to deny more strongly than οὔποτε. Yet Böhme's rendering of μήποτε by *nondum* is erroneous; it means, *never, never at all* (Heliod. 2, 19). And perhaps the author gave the preference to μήποτε on this account also, because he is speaking in general terms and not of any particular testament. However, in later authors the subjective negation frequently occurs in connection with ἐπεί (ὅτι) *quandoquidem*, not only where something is clearly designated as a subjective reason (as is perceptible even in Aelian. 12, 63; cf. besides, Philostr. Apoll. 7, 16; Lucian. Hermot. 47), but also where an objectively valid reason is assigned (Gayl. 183 sqq.; Mdv. p. 245; on Lucian and Arrian in particular, Ellendt, Arrian. Al. I. praefat. p. 23 sqq., cf. also Ptol. geogr. 8, 1, 3), in so far as the reason falls back at last on a supposition. Others (Bengel, Lchm.) take μήποτε in Heb., as above, as an interrogative, as indeed ἐπεί often introduces a question, Rom. iii. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 16; xv. 29; Klotz, Devar. p. 543. This seems to me, however, to be too rhetorical for the style.

3. e. In relative clauses with ἄν (ἐάν), Luke viii. 18 ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, Acts iii. 23 (Sept.) πᾶσα ψυχή, ἥτις ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ, Rev. xiii. 15 ὅσοι ἂν μὴ προσκυνήσωσιν, Luke ix. 5. In all these cases nothing is denied as a matter of fact of particular subjects, but the language is only conditional and supposed: whoever hath not (may not have). Relative clauses without ἄν have regularly οὐ, Jno. iv. 22 προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε, Luke xiv. 27 ὅστις οὐ βαστάζει, Rom. x. 14; 1 Cor. v. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 10; 1 Jno. iv. 6, etc., so far forth as they deny something as matter of fact; on the other hand,
448 μή occurs sometimes in such cases when the negation refers only
7th ed. to a supposition (assumption, condition) (Hm. Vig. 805; Krü. 271), 2 Pet. i. 9 ᾧ μὴ πάρεστι ταῦτα, τυφλός ἐστιν *whoso lacketh, if any man lack*, etc. In 1 Tim. v. 13; Tit. i. 11 τὰ μὴ δέοντα and ἃ μὴ δεῖ (cf. Rom. i. 28; Soph. Phil. 583) express merely a moral conception: *quae, si quae non sunt honesta;* whereas ἃ οὐ δεῖ would denote positively *inhonesta*, the kind of unseemly things objectively present, cf. Gayl. 240 f. In Col. ii. 18 μή before

ἑώρακεν[1] is expunged by the more recent critics; only Tisch. in the 2d [and 7th] Leipzig ed. restores it, and undoubtedly it has 503
the greatest amount of external authority on its side (Mey. states the authorities imperfectly). If the negation [which is wanting, moreover, in Cod. Sin.*] be genuine (some authorities have οὐ), μή must be used because even the relative clause is viewed by 427
Paul subjectively, as μηδεὶς ὑμ. καταβραβευέτω.[2] 6th ed.

Frequently ὅς is followed by οὐ, where, since apparently a mere supposition is uttered, some have expected μή (Lipsius de modis p. 14), as in Matt. xxiv. 2 οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὧδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον, ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται (but here μή is not indispensable, inasmuch as the words deny a matter of fact); and also where in Latin the Subjunctive would stand, and therefore μή would have been expected, Matt. x. 26 οὐδέν ἐστι κεκαλυμμένον, ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται, Luke viii. 17; xii. 2; Matt. xxiv. 2; cf. 1 Kings viii. 46. For instances from Greek authors (Hm. Vig. p. 709) see Eur. Hel. 509 sq. ἀνὴρ γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε ... ὃς ... οὐ δώσει βοράν, Lucian. sacrif. 1 οὐκ οἶδα, εἴ τις οὕτω κατηφής ἐστι, ὅστις οὐ γελάσεται, Soph. Oed. R. 374 οὐδεὶς ὃς οὐχὶ τῶνδ' ὀνειδιεῖ τάχα. In all these cases the relative clause is considered as a definite, objective predicate, as if it were said ἀνὴρ οὐδεὶς ὧδε οὐ δώσει βοράν; even in construction with the Optative, Isocr. Evagor. p. 452 οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅστις οὐκ ἂν Αἰακίδος προκρίνειεν, also p. 199; Plut. apophth. p. 196 c. Closely allied to this is the phrase τίς ἐστιν, ὃς οὐ followed by the Pres. indic. Acts xix. 35; Heb. xii. 7; cf. Dion. comp. 11 ed. Schaef. p. 120, which in sense is equivalent to οὐδείς ἐστιν, ὃς οὐ (for which Strabo 6, 286 has οὐδὲν μέρος αὐτῆς ἐστιν, ὃ μὴ ... τυγχάνει); on the other hand, οὐδείς ἐστιν, ὃς οὐ with the Preterite, is beyond the range of those cases in which one would expect μή, Xen. An. 4, 5, 31; Thuc. 3, 81; Lucian. Tox. 22; asin. 49; cf. Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 233; Weber, Demosth. 356 sq. See also Gayl. p. 257 sqq., who, it must be confessed, has not discriminated sufficiently.

4. f. With Infinitives (Mtth. 1442; Krü. 273), not only such as depend on a verb of *thinking*, *speaking*, *commanding*, *wishing* (of 449
course also in the construction of the Accusative with the Infini- 7th ed.
tive) Matt. ii. 12; v. 34, 39; Luke ii. 26; v. 14; xx. 7; xxi. 14; Acts iv. 17 f. 20; v. 28; x. 28; xv. 19, 38; xix. 31; xxi. 4; xxiii. 8; xxvii. 21; Rom. ii. 21 f; xii. 3; xiii. 3; 1 Cor. v. 9, 11;

[1] Cf. Philostr. Apoll. 7, 27 διελέγετο ἃ μὴ ἐκείνῳ προὔβαινε quae illi *haud* prodessent. From the Sept. may be adduced Exod. ix. 21 ὃς μὴ προσέσχε τῇ διανοίᾳ εἰς τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου in opposition to ὁ φοβούμενος τὸ ῥῆμα κυρίου vs. 20; thus just like εἰ δὲ μή in antithesis. Οὐ and μή after relat. in parallel propositions, see Arrian. Epict. 2, 2, 4.

[2] In propositions with particles of time (*Gayler*, p 185 sqq.) μή does not happen to occur in the N. T.; several times οὐ is quite regularly joined to the Indicative of time, Jno. ix. 4; xvi. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 3; Acts xxii. 11.

2 Cor. ii. 1; x. 2; Heb. ix. 8, etc., or by which a design is expressed 2 Cor. iv. 4 *ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα . . . εἰς τὸ μὴ αὐγάσαι*, 1 Thess. ii. 9 *ἐργαζόμενοι πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαι*, Acts xx. 27 *οὐχ*
504 *ὑπεστειλάμην τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι*, 1 Pet. iv. 2, — but also where the Infinitive is the subject of a proposition, 2 Pet. ii. 21 *κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι*, Luke xvii. 1, or, being joined to a preposition, is resolvable into a finite verb with *οὐ*, Jas. iv. 2 *οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς* (*ὅτι οὐκ αἰτεῖσθε ὑμεῖς*), Luke viii. 6; Acts xxviii. 18; Heb. x. 2. But in that first case *ἐπεγνωκ.* is denied only as a supposition (in fact they had known), and in the second the cause is represented not objectively, but as primarily the thought of the speaker. Precedents from the classics for all
428 this, see in Gayler 294 sqq.; cf. Rost 750; Bäumlein nr. 99, S.
6th ed. 788 f. Also those parts of speech which belong essentially to the Infinitive clause are negatived by *μή*, e.g. 2 Cor. x. 2.

The cases in the Infinitive *construction* in which *οὐ* is, and can or must be, used have been pointed out by Rost 747 f.; Krü. 274; Bäumlein S. 778. In Jno. xxi. 25 *ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἕν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφ. βιβλία* the negation belongs to *οἶμαι*, cf. Xen. M. 2, 2, 10 *ἐγὼ μὲν οἶμαι, εἰ τοιαύτην μὴ δύνασαι φέρειν μητέρα, ἀγαθά σε οὐ δύνασθαι φέρειν.* In Heb. vii. 11 *τίς ἔτι χρεία κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδ. ἕτερον ἀνίστασθαι ἱερέα καὶ οὐ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν λέγεσθαι* the negation does not belong to the Infinitive, but negatives the words *κατὰ τ. τάξ. Ἀαρ.* *Οὐ* is often in dependent clauses joined thus to a single word, Krü. S. 270.

When after a verb of *understanding* or *saying*, in direct discourse etc., the assertion, observation etc. is expressed in a clause with *ὅτι*, the negation is made by *οὐ*, Luke xiv. 24 *λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν . . . γεύσεται τοῦ δείπνου*, xviii. 29; Jno. v. 42 *ἔγνωκα ὑμᾶς ὅτι τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε* etc., viii. 55; Acts ii. 31 etc. The proposition with *ὅτι* stands here as a pure objective proposition just as in indirect question (§ 41, 4), as if it were *οὐδεὶς . . . γεύσεται, τοῦτο ὑμῖν λέγω*, while the Infinitive construction brings it into immediate connection with, and consequently dependence on, *λέγω, ὁρῶ* etc. Cf. Krü. 253, 270; Mdv. 235.

5. g. With Participles (Gayl. 274 sqq.; Krü. 274 f.) *μή* is used not only when they belong to a proposition which, as expressing command, design, condition, etc., requires the subjective negation (see no. 2), Eph. v. 27; Phil. i. 28; ii. 4; iii. 9; 2 Thess. ii. 12; Heb. vi. 1; Jas. i. 5; Tit. ii. 9 f.; Rom. viii. 4; xiv. 3; Matt. xxii. 24; Acts xv. 38; Luke iii. 11; 2 Cor. xii. 21; cf. Soph. Oed.

C. 1155, 980; Plato, rep. 2, 370 e.; Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26; Krü. 275, — but also under other circumstances: 450 7th ed.

a. when they refer, not to particular persons, but to a supposed genus: Matt. xii. 30 *ὁ μὴ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν he who is not with me* i.e. whoever belongs to this class of men that I have in mind, *si quis non stet a meis partibus*, Hm. Vig. 805; Mtth. 1441 sq.; Krü. 174 (*ὁ οὐκ ὢν μετ' ἐμοῦ* would mean a particular individual who actually was not with him), Matt. xxv. 29; Luke vi. 49; Jno. x. 1; xii. 48; xx. 24 [?]; Rom. iv. 5; xiv. 22; Jas. ii. 13; iv. 17; 1 Jno. ii. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 37; hence with *πᾶς* Matt. xiii. 19; Jno. xv. 2. Also 2 Jno. 7 *πολλοὶ πλάνοι εἰςῆλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον οἱ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν Χρ.* etc. belongs here; the words do not mean many deceivers — namely, those who do not confess (*οἱ οὐχ ὁμολ.*) — but, many deceivers, all those who do not confess, quicunque non profitentur. 505

β. when they apply to particular persons indeed, but ascribe to them a quality only conditionally or in thought: Luke xi. 24 *ὅταν ... ἐξέλθῃ ... διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ μὴ εὑρίσκον λέγει if he finds it not, in case he does not* etc., Rom. ii. 14; Gal. vi. 9 *θερίσομεν μὴ ἐκλυόμενοι*, Luke xii. 47 *ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοῦλος* (vs. 45 f.) *ὁ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα δαρήσεται* (this is propounded as one of two possible cases); 1 Cor. x. 33 *πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω, μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἐμαυτοῦ συμφέρον I seek to please all*, (supposition) *as one who, inasmuch as I* etc., ix. 21; 2 Cor. vi. 3; Rom. xv. 23; 1 Thess. iii. 1, 5 (against Rückert see Lünemann in loc.); Jno. vii. 15 *πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδε μὴ μεμαθηκώς;* since he can't have learned (since we, surely, know him to be such a one as has never learned? cf. Philostr. Apoll. 3, 22 *ὃς καὶ γράφει μὴ μαθὼν γράμματα*). Luke vii. 33 *ἐλήλυθεν Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων ἄρτον μήτε πίνων οἶνον without having eaten ... drunken* (spoken from the position of those who, observing this, are introduced as saying so); *οὔτε ἐσθίων οὔτε πίνων* would express the predicates as pure matters of fact. In Luke iv. 35 *τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν*, by the last words the author does not mean to relate a mere matter of fact (*οὐδὲν βλάψ. αὐτόν and did not harm him*), but to exclude merely the thought that the evil spirit had in any way injured the possessed: *he had not* (as one might perhaps have thought) *injured him.* 429 6th ed.

Thus *μή* is very often to be understood: Acts v. 7; xx. 22; Heb. iv. 15; xi. 8; Matt. xxii. 12. Cf. what Klotz says, Devar. p. 666: quibus in locis omnibus propterea *μή* positum est, non *οὐ*,

quod ille, qui loquitur, non rem ipsam spectat sed potius cogitationem rei, quam vult ex animo audientis amovere (Plut. Pompej.
506 c. 64); Hm. Vig. 806. In Matt. xviii. 25 *μὴ ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ πραθῆναι* etc. the first words express a *fact*, indeed, *as he had not;* but in this construction they
451 are put in close relation with *ἐκέλ.*: *he commanded, because that*
7th ed. *man had not*, because he knew that the man had not, etc. So also Acts xxi. 34; Luke ii. 45; xxiv. 23; Acts ix. 26; xiii. 28; xvii. 6; xxvii. 7, 20; 1 Pet. iv. 4; 2 Pet. iii. 9; cf. Plut. Pompej. c. 23 and Alex. 51; Polyb. 17, 7, 5; 5, 30, 5. On Rom. ix. 11 see Fr. Acts xx. 29 *οἶδα ὅτι εἰσελεύσονται ... λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς ὑμᾶς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου* is, as the Future shows, to be taken altogether as an ideal picture. Also Heb. ix. 9 *μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ συνείδησιν τελειῶσαι* etc. is spoken in the view of the writer; had it been *οὐ δυνάμ.* an actual inherent property would have been signified (*not being able*), but such offerings Israelites would not have presented. 1 Cor. i. 28 *ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ*, where *τὰ οὐκ ὄντα* would signify (Hm. Vig. 889) *the non-existing* (as a *single* negative idea), but *τὰ μὴ ὄντα* must mean *which were reckoned as things that did not exist;* the *ὄντα* is negatived as a supposition, not spoken actually of *nonentities.*[1] In 2 Cor. iv. 18 (even in the second proposition, which is categorical) to *τὰ βλεπόμενα* stands opposed *τὰ μὴ βλεπ.*, not *τὰ οὐ βλεπ.* (Heb. xi. 1). This last would denote what actually is not seen
430 (*τὰ ἀόρατα*), but *τὰ μὴ βλεπ.* expresses, in conjunction with *μὴ*
8th ed. *σκοπούντων ἡμῶν*, the *subjective* view of the believer, cf. Heb. xi. 7. Also in 2 Cor. v. 21 *τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησε*, the *μὴ. γν.* carries us back to the conception of him who makes him *ἁμαρτία*; *τὸν οὐ γνόντα* would be objective and equivalent to *τὸν ἀγνοοῦντα*,[2] Isae. 1, 11 and Schoem. in loc. 2 Cor. vi. 3 does not read *οὐδεμίαν ἐν οὐδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν*, because this would exhibit merely an actually existing characteristic, but *μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδ. πρ.* because the characteristic is regarded, in connection with *παρακαλοῦμεν* vs. 1, as subjectively adhered to and continually striven after. Cf. besides, Luke vii. 30; Jno. vii. 49; 1 Cor. ix. 20 f. So with *ὡς* in subjective speech, 1 Cor. iv. 7 *τί καυχᾶσαι ὡς μὴ λαβών;* iv. 18; vii. 29; 2 Cor. x. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 16; Gayler 278 sq. (otherwise 1 Cor. ix. 26, see below).

[1] Μὴ ὄντα and *οὐκ ὄντα* are united in Xen. An. 4, 4, 15.

[2] The remark of *Rückert* on this passage, that in Greek *οὐ* never stands between the article and participle but always *μή*, is wholly empirical, and false besides, and has been properly refuted by *Mey.*

On the other hand, *οὐ* with participles (and adjectives) — with which it occurs far less frequently — negatives actually and without qualification (Gayl. 287 sq.; Mtth. 1442), and hence stands especially with predicates which are denied of definite persons:[1] Phil. iii. 3 *ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή, οἱ πνεύματι θεῷ λατρεύοντες ... καὶ οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες* (the *ἡμεῖς*, since they actually are *πνεύμ. θεῷ λατρ.*, are denied to be *ἐν σαρκὶ πεποιθότες*); 1 Pet. ii. 10 *ὑμεῖς ... οἱ οὐκ ἐλεημένοι, νῦν δὲ ἐλεηθέντες*, Rom. ix. 25 (LXX.); Heb. xi. 35 *ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ... ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν* (*not accepting*, i.e. disdaining); Col. ii. 19 *εἰκῇ φυσιούμενος ... καὶ οὐ κρατῶν*, although the sentence is imperative (vs. 18 *μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω* and *ἃ μὴ ἑώρακεν* etc.), yet with *οὐ κρατ.* the apostle passes over to a predicate actually existing, Acts xvii. 27; Luke vi. 42; 1 Cor. ix. 26 *ἐγὼ οὕτω πυκτεύω, ὡς οὐκ ἀέρα δέρων* (*οὐκ ἀέρα δέρ.* a concrete predicate which Paul attributes to himself, *ὡς* is qualitative; *ὡς μὴ ἀ. δ.* would be *as if I would not beat the air*), Gal. iv. 27 (LXX) *εὐφράνθητι στεῖρα ἡ οὐ τίκτουσα* etc. *thou that bearest not!* of a historic person; see besides 1 Cor. iv. 14; 2 Cor. iv. 8 f.; Acts xxvi. 22; xxviii. 17; Heb. xi. 1, (adjectives with *οὐ* Rom. viii. 20; Heb. ix. 11); cf. Xen. Cyr. 8, 8, 6; Her. 9, 83; Plato, Phaed. 80 e.; Demosth. Zenothem. p. 576 b.; Strabo 17, 796 and 822; Diod. S. 19, 97; Philostr. Apol. 7, 32; Aelian. 10, 11; Lucian. Philops. 5; peregr. 34. 452 7th ed. 507

In 1 Pet. i. 8 both the negatives are used together: *ὃν οὐκ εἰδότες ἀγαπᾶτε, εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ ὁρῶντες πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε* etc.; the *οὐκ εἰδ.* expresses the negative idea (*personally*) *unknown* as a matter of fact; the *μὴ ὁρ.* means, *although ye see not*, referring to the conception of the persons addressed: believing, ye rejoice in him, and the thought that ye see him not does not restrain you from rejoicing. (In like manner *οὐ* and *μή* are construed with participles in one and the same sentence in Lucian. indoct. 5 *καὶ ὁ κυβερνᾶν οὐκ εἰδὼς καὶ ἱππεύειν μὴ μεμελετηκώς* etc., cf. also Lycurg. 11, 9 and Blume in loc.). In Rom. i. 28 we find *παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, ποιεῖν τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα*, but in Eph. v. 3 f. *πορνεία καὶ πᾶσα ἀκαθαρσία ...* 431 6th ed.

[1] The difference between *οὐ* and *μή* with participles is well illustrated by Plat. Phaed. 63 b. *ἠδίκουν ἂν οὐκ ἀγανακτῶν* injuste facerem ego, qui non indignor; on the other hand, *ἠδ. ἂν μὴ ἀγαν.* (according to Olympiod.) injuste facerem si non indignarer. Cf. also Joseph. antt. 16, 7, 5 *ὁ δὲ Φερώρας εἰς μέσον ἀπείληπτο, μηδὲν εὔσχημον εἰς ἀπολογίαν ἔχων ... ἀκοῦσαι δ' οὐ πιστεύόμενος.*

μηδὲ ὀνομαζέσθω ἐν ὑμῖν ... ἢ εὐτραπελία, τὰ οὐκ ἀνήκοντα. The latter (in apposition) is to be resolved, *which are unseemly things* (which a Christian is bound to shun), actions which are not seemly (as indeed some Codd. [so too Cod. Sin.] have: ἃ οὐκ ἀνῆκεν). Gal. iv. 8 τότε οὐκ εἰδότες θεὸν ἐδουλεύσατε etc. is a glance at a past historic fact, and οὐκ εἰδ. form *a single* idea: *ignorantes deum, ἄθεοι*; on the contrary, 1 Thess. iv. 5 τὰ ἔθνη
508 τὰ μὴ εἰδότα τὸν θεόν, and 2 Thess. i. 8 τοῖς μὴ εἰδόσι θεόν, in dependent construction.

Sometimes, however, μή would appear to stand for οὐ, but Rom. iv. 19 καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα etc. means, *he regarded not his body, quippe qui non esset imbecillis*; κατενόησε expresses a fact, but *the being weak in faith* only a supposition, which is to be denied (οὐκ ἀσθενήσας would mean, *strong in faith*). According to another construction, it might, indeed, also have run thus: οὐκ ἠσθένησεν ... ὥστε
453 κατανοῆσαι etc., cf. Plut. reg. apophth. p. 81 Tauchn. On the other hand,
7th ed. Heb. vii. 6 ὁ δὲ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν δεδεκάτωκε τὸν Ἀβραάμ is probably to be explained on the principle, that in antitheses (cf. vs. 5), where a peculiarly strong negation is intended (and the negative is accented), the Greeks use μή (by which even the supposition is denied). See above, no. 1 and Hm. Soph. Antig. 691, which will be quoted presently. In Luke i. 20 ἔσῃ σιωπῶν καὶ μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι the subjective negation is so much the more fitting, as a particular condition is designated as but just announced, and consequently existing but in thought (ἔσῃ). So also Acts xiii. 11. The connection of the subjective and objective negatives appears strangest in Acts ix. 9 ἦν ἡμέρας τρεῖς μὴ βλέπων καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲ ἔπιεν (cf. Epiphan. Opp. II. 368 etc. ἦν δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς μὴ δυνάμενος λαλῆσαι). But here the not eating and not drinking are related as matters of fact; whereas the βλέπειν, which from vs. 8 one might have supposed to be returning, is as a supposition denied antithetically. The remark of Hm. Soph. Antig. 691 is applicable here: μή fortius est, quia ad oppositum refertur: nam οὐκ ἐᾶν simpliciter est *prohibere*, μὴ ἐᾶν autem dicitur, quum, quem credas siturum, non sinit. Accordingly οὐ βλέπων there would have meant *blind* outright; μὴ βλέπων affirms *not seeing* of one who had had his sight and might be supposed to have it again. Cf. also Jno. vii. 49 ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος, ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, where the ὄχλος is denied an attribute which it could and should have had; μὴ γινώσκ. conveys a censure, οὐ γινώσκ. would be a simple predicate: unacquainted with the law. See besides, Luke xiii. 11; Mark v. 26; Acts ix. 7 (cf. vs. 3).

Although, then, it may be quite true as Schaef. says, Demosth. III. 495: in scriptis cadentis graecitatis vix credas, quoties participialis constructio (especially that of the Genit. absol.) non οὐ etc., ut oportebat, sed μή etc. adsciscat, cf. also Plut. V. 6; Thilo, Acta Thom. p. 28, and above, p. 473

note [2], yet it is indispensable to scrutinize sharply every passage even from the writers of the κοινή, before asserting that μή stands for οὐ (Fr. Rom. II. 295); in particular, as has been already remarked, it should not be overlooked that often much depends, especially in the construction of negatives with participles, on the mode in which the author conceives of his subject, Hm. Vig. 804, 806; Mtth. 1437, 1441. On the general subject cf. also Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 244; Bähr in Creuzer, Melet. III. 20; Schaef. Eurip. Med. 811 ed. Porson.[1] 432 6th ed. 509

6. Continued negation is, as is well known, expressed by the compound negatives οὐδέ, μηδέ, and οὔτε, μήτε.[2] The difference between the two words has often been discussed in modern philology, but has not yet been developed in all its relations and with complete unanimity; see especially Hm. Eurip. Med. 330 sqq. (also in his Opusc. III. 143 sqq.) and ad Philoctet. p. 140, then Franke, comm. II. 5 sqq.; Wex, Antig. II. 156 sqq.; Klotz, Devar. II. 706 sqq.[3] 454 7th ed.

Undoubtedly οὐδέ and οὔτε run parallel with the conjunctions δέ and τε, and must be explained primarily from their meaning; accordingly we may say with Herm. that οὔτε, μήτε are adjunctive, οὐδέ, μηδέ disjunctive (δέ is properly *but*, and denotes an opposition, Franke II. 5), i.e. the latter add negation to negation, the former divide a single negation into parts (which last of course are mutually exclusive).[4] For instance, Matt. vii. 6 μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσί, μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας etc. *give not — and cast not* (two different actions are equally denied, i.e. interdicted); Matt. vi. 26 οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν etc. *they sow not, and they reap not, and they gather not.* On the other

[1] On Aelian. 3, 2 ὁ δὲ μηδὲν διαταραχθεὶς εἶπεν, 14, 33 ὃς οὐδὲν διαταραχθεὶς εἶπεν, see *Fr.* Rom. II. 295. Elsewhere οὐ is taken for μή with particip. sometimes in Plut., see *Held*, Plutarch. Tim. p. 457 sq., also in Aelian, see *Jacobs*, Aelian. anim. II. 187. In like manner οὐ seems to me to stand for μή in Basilic. I. 150 παίδων οὐχ ὑπόντων *si filii non exstant.* As it stands it means, *since children are not in existence.* (Polyb. 7, 9, 12 τῶν θεῶν οὐ δόντων ὑμῖν καὶ ἡμῖν which *Gayler* quotes, p. 591, is merely a conjectural reading of *Casaubon.*) In Lucian. saltat. 75, on the contrary, the transition from μήτε into οὔτε is owing to an anacoluthon. Lastly, οὐ and μή are differently construed with participles in Aelian. anim. 5, 28; see *Jacobs* in loc.

[2] Where οὐδέ does not refer to a preceding negation, it denotes, as is well known, *also not*, or *not even* (*Klotz*, Devar. 707). On the latter meaning see *Franke* II. 11.

[3] Cf. *Hand*, de partic. τε dissert. 2 p. 9 sqq.; *Engelhardt*, Plat. Lach. p. 69 sq.; *Stallb.* Plat. Lach. p. 65, also Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1812. no. 194 S. 516 and *Hartung*, Partik. I. 191 ff.

[4] *Benfey* in the new Jahrb. f. Philol. XII. 155: "As τε . . . τε connects only ideas or propositions which are mutually complementary and combine into one whole, so οὔτε . . . οὔτε can connect only such. This higher unity or complex whole is divided by the negatived complementary parts; in these neither the negation of the one nor of the other is a whole, but each must be supplemented."

hand, Matt. xii. 32 *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι* forgiveness will not be imparted, *neither* in this
433 world, *nor* in that which is to come (the single negation *οὐκ ἀφεθ.*
6th ed. is distributed into two parts on the basis of time); Luke ix. 3
510 *μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν μήτε ῥάβδον μήτε πήραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀργύριον.*

In this acceptation, then, the following particles are usually correlative:

a. *Οὐ ... οὐδέ* Matt. vi. 28; vii. 18; Luke vi. 44; Jno. xiii. 16; xiv. 17; Acts ix. 9; Rom. ii. 28, *μή ... μηδέ* Matt. vi. 25; x. 14; xxiii. 9 f.; Mark xiii. 15; Luke xvii. 23; Jno. iv. 15; Acts iv. 18; Rom. vi. 12 f.; 2 Cor. iv. 2; 1 Tim. i. 3 f., *οὐ ... οὐδέ ... οὐδέ* Matt. xii. 19; Jno. i. 13, 25,[1] *μή ... μηδέ ... μηδέ* Rom. xiv. 21; Col. ii. 21; Luke xiv. 12 (*not ... nor ... nor*);

b. *Οὐ ... οὔτε ... οὔτε* Matt. xii. 32, *μή ... μήτε ... μήτε* 1 Tim. i. 7, *μή ... μήτε ... μήτε ... μήτε* Jas. v. 12 (*μήτε* three times), Matt. v. 34 ff. (*μήτε* four times) *not ... neither ... nor* etc.; but
455 still more frequently without a simple negation preceding, Jno.
7th ed. v. 37 *οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκηκόατε πώποτε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε*, Matt. vi. 20; xxii. 30; Luke xiv. 35; Jno. viii. 19; ix. 3; Acts xv. 10; 1 Thess. ii. 5 f.; Rom. viii. 38 (ten times), Matt. xi. 18 *ἦλθε Ἰωάννης μήτε ἐσθίων μήτε πίνων*, Acts xxvii. 20; Heb. vii. 3[2] *neither ... nor* etc. Accordingly, *οὔτε* and *μήτε* regularly refer to another *οὔτε* and *μήτε* (or *τε* or *καί*)[3] — just as *τε ... τε* (*τε ... καί*) correspond to each other; but *οὐδέ* and *μηδέ* connect themselves with a preceding *οὐ* or *μή*, as in fact *δέ* always refers to something that precedes. Hence it may be laid down as a principle (resulting from the respective import of *τε* and *δέ*), that *οὔτε ... οὔτε* denote a more intimate connection than *οὐ ... οὐδέ*. Klotz, Devar. 707 sq.[4] In this correlation, however, it is a

[1] In Judges i. 27 we find *οὐ* followed by *οὐδέ* fourteen times.

[2] 1 Cor. vi. 10 *οὔτε ... οὔτε ... οὔτε ... οὔτε ... οὔτε ... οὔτε ... οὔτε ... οὐ ... οὐ* etc. is remarkable only for the accumulation of negatives. For that there is nothing singular in *οὐ* coming after *οὔτε*, even though it be not supported by the passage quoted by *Gayl.* 386 from Soph. Antig. 4 f., cf. (Dio C. 205, 6; 412, 59) *Klotz* l. c. 711. See also no. 9 below, p. 500.

[3] As to a single *μήτε* with the suppression of the other, see *Hm.* Soph. Philoct. p. 139 sq. and in general, *Franke* II. 13 sq.

[4] Cum *οὔτε* et ad priora respicere possit et ad sequentia, aptior connexio est singulorum membrorum per eas particulas, multo autem dissolutior et fortuita magis conjunctio membrorum per *οὐδέ ... οὐδέ* particulas, quia prius *οὐδέ* nunquam respicit ad ea quae sequuntur sed ad priora ... alterum autem *οὐδέ* per aliquam oppositionis rationem, quam habet *δέ* particula, sequentia adjungit prioribus, non apte connexa, sed potius fortuito concursu accedentia. On this account, however, *δέ* is still stronger than *τε*. *Franke* II. 6, 15.

matter of indifference whether the things denied are individual words (conceptions) merely, or entire sentences; and entire sentences are with as much propriety rendered negative by *οὔτε . . . οὔτε* Acts xxviii. 21 (Plato, rep. 10, 597 c.; Phaedr. 260 c.), as individual words are by *οὐ . . . οὐδέ*.[1] In the latter case, it is true, the verb serves for all the negative members. Matt. x. 9 *μὴ* 511
κτήσησθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκόν, 2 Pet. i. 8 *οὐκ ἀργοὺς οὐδὲ ἀκάρπους καθίστησιν* etc., Matt. xxii. 29; xxiv. 20; xxv. 13; 1 Jno. iii. 18. In Matt. x. 9 the other form of negation might have been employed, if the evangelist had said *μηδὲν κτήσ. μήτε χρυσὸν μήτε ἄργ.* etc., cf. Franke II. 8. Further, Matt. vi. 20, and 434
Matt. x. 9 compared with Luke ix. 3, throw especial light on the 6th ed.
distinction between *οὐδέ* and *οὔτε*.

The succession *οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . καὶ οὐ* Jno. v. 37 f., as the interpretation which has latterly become usual connects the clauses, would be no more liable to grammatical objection than *οὔτε . . . τε οὐ* Hm. Soph. Antig. 759; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. p. 68; yet the clause with *καί . . . οὐ* does not sustain quite the same relation as if *οὔτε* were employed. I consider it, therefore, preferable not to comprehend *καί . . . οὐ* in the partition. See Mey. in loc.

From what has been said it follows further,

a) *οὐδέ . . . οὐδέ, μηδέ . . . μηδέ*, in the sense of *neither . . . nor* (when a single negation does not precede), cannot be correlative 456
(on Thuc. 1, 142 see Poppo in loc., and on Xen. Anab. 3, 1, 27 7th ed.
the same author's Index to the Anab. p. 535); but where one negation is annexed to another, or where a series of negations occurs, the first is expressed by *οὐ* or *μή*, and only in this way is a foundation laid for the antithetical disjunctive *δέ*.[2] Mark viii. 26 *λέγων, μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς μηδὲ εἴπῃς τινί* etc. cannot signify neque . . . neque; but the first *μηδέ* denotes *ne . . . quidem*, and the second *also not* (*nor*), see Mey. in loc. Cf. Eurip. Hippol. 1052 and Klotz, Devar. 708. The case is different when the first *οὐδέ* connects the clause to what precedes, as e.g. in the case of *οὐδὲ γάρ* in Gal. i. 12 *οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρ. παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὐδὲ ἐδιδάχθην*, yet on this passage see below, p. 492.

b) as *οὔτε* and *μήτε* always introduce co-ordinate members of a partition, *μήτε* is incongruous in Mark iii. 20 *ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαι μήτε ἄρτον φαγεῖν*,[3] for *μὴ φαγ.* here is dependent on *δύνασθαι*.

[1] Hence *Mtth.* 1444 does not express himself with accuracy.

[2] On *οὐδέ* and *μηδέ* after an affirmative sentence, see *Engelhardt*, Plat. Lach. p. 64 sq.; *Franke*, p. 6, 8 sq.

[3] That even in the latest edition of *Griesbach's* N. T. *μήτε* should remain unchanged,

As the text now stands it can only mean: *that they neither had*
512 *power, nor ate* (the first μή being used for μήτε). The sense, however, obviously is: *that they were not able (not) even* [*so much as*] *to eat;* accordingly, μηδέ must be restored on the authority of the better Codd. (see Fr. in loc.), which has been done by Lchm. and Tdf., but not by Scholz. In the same way we must read in Mark v. 3 οὐδὲ ἁλύσει, in Luke xii. 26 οὐδὲ ἐλάχιστον δύνασθε, in vii. 9 οὐδὲ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ,[1] and in Luke xx. 36, where οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται (as good Codd. read) is not parallel to the preceding sentence οὔτε ... οὔτε, but the confirmation of it: *neque*
435 *enim*.[2] Cf. also Matt. v. 36. In these passages also Scholz re-
6th ed. printed the old mistakes.

c) as οὔτε ... οὔτε introduce negative members of a partition, and these mutually exclude each other (Hm. Med. p. 332), the reading of some Codd. [Sin. also] οὔτε οἶδα οὔτε ἐπίσταμαι (which Lchm. and Tdf. [2d ed., not so 7th] have received into the text) in Mark xiv. 68 cannot be supported: *neque novi neque scio* can hardly be said, — the verbs being nearly identical in sense. Cf. Franke II. 13; Schaef. Demosth. III. 449; Fr. in loc. Griesb. has
457 received into the text οὐκ οἶδα οὐδὲ ἐπίσταμαι; cf. Cic. Rosc. Am. 43
7th ed. non (not neque) novi neque scio, which according to the meaning of the two verbs is very suitable.[3]

d) οὔτε may indeed follow οὐ, so far forth as οὐ as respects sense is to be taken for οὔτε, see Hm. as above, p. 333 sqq. 401 and Soph. Antig. p. 110, in opposition to Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 4, 5 and Soph. Oed. T. 817; cf. Franke II. 27 sq.; Maetzner, Antiphon p. 195 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 444; Klotz, as above, 709 sq.[4] Accord-

is remarkable. What is still more strange, however, is, that *Griesbach* and *Schulz* have not even noted the var. μηδέ given by *approved* Codd. See, on the other hand, *Scholz* in loc.

[1] On the same ground οὐδέ should be printed also in Act. apocr. p. 168. Yet *Döderlein*, Progr. de brachylogia serm. gr. p. 17, considers οὔτε correct in such case, maintaining that inasmuch as τε like καί may denote *etiam* this negation also may be used in the sense of *ne quidem*. See in opposition *Franke* II. 11.

[2] *Bornem.* insists on construing οὔτε with the following καί (see no. 7 below, p. 494), but the clause καὶ υἱοί etc. goes with ἰσάγγελοι γάρ.

[3] When οὔτε ... οὔτε is used, it is true "the two notions are regarded as forming one compound thought" (*Mey.*); but this supposes that there actually are *two* notions, which may be connected affirmatively by *as well ... as*.

[4] "In rare cases, and in virtue of a rhetorical figure, it is allowable to drop the complementary particle of the one οὐ, and so impart to the member thus stripped of its complementary symbol greater apparent independence, and consequently greater rhetorical force; just as we may say in poetry *Not father nor mother*, instead of *Neither father nor mother*," etc. *Benfey*, as above, 155. Cf. *Hm.* l.c. 333, 401 and *Franke* (who differs somewhat) II. 27, (also *Döderlein*, Progr. de brachylogia p. 6).

ingly, *οὔτε*[1] in Rev. ix. 21 is unassailable, Mtth. 1448; though the usage in question passes as poetical, Franke II. 28. The same 513
correlation is to be recognized in Rev. v. 4 *οὐδεὶς ἄξιος εὑρέθη ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλέπειν αὐτό* (as Tdf. also reads), cf. Klotz, Devar. II. 709 sq. and the passage adduced there from Aristot. polit. 1, 3, though the writer might also have said: *οὐδεὶς ἄξ. εὑρέθη οὔτε ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὔτε βλ.* But *μή ... μήτε* cannot be tolerated in Eph. iv. 27, where the best MSS. [also Sin.] unite in giving *μηδέ*, which Lchm. has admitted into the text. This usage is a sort of anacoluthon; in employing *οὐ* the writer had not yet the subsequent parallel member in view. Sometimes it may even have been adopted purposely, in order to give prominence to the first word. In Rev. xii. 8 also *οὐδέ* appears to me the more correct expression, and it has been adopted by Knapp. On the other hand, in Jno. i. 25 *εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὔτε Ἠλίας οὔτε ὁ προφήτης* linguistic propriety does not require that *οὐδέ* should be employed (cf. Hm. Soph. Philoct. p. 140), yet the better Codd. [Sin. also] give it. Likewise in Rev. v. 3 *οὐδεὶς ἠδύνατο ἐν τῷ* 436
οὐρανῷ οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οὐδὲ ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον 6th ed.
οὐδὲ βλέπειν αὐτό the relation of the negations is appropriate: *no one ... nor on the earth, nor ... to open ... nor* (not even) *to look upon it.*

e) as to *οὔτε* (several times) ... *οὐδέ* Acts xxiv. 12 f. according to Lchm. and Bornem. from Codd. B [and Sin.] see Hm. Soph. Oed. C. 229; Franke II. 14 sqq.; Klotz, Devar. II. 714. The *οὐδέ* is not correlative to *οὔτε*, but commences a new sentence: they *neither* found me in the temple ... *nor* in the synagogues, ... *nor* can they (*and* they can *not*) etc. Most of the Codd., however, 458
give *οὔτε* vs. 13. Then *οὔτε ... εὗρόν με ... οὔτε παραστῆσαι* 7th ed.
δύνανται are regular correlates, and to the first proposition belong *οὔτε ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς οὔτε κατὰ πόλιν* as subordinate members. On Luke xx. 36, see p. 490.

That in negative sentences the subordinate members are introduced by *ἤ*, has already been stated, § 53, 6. On the other hand, in Acts xvii. 29, according to the reading (adopted by Bornem.) of Cod. D *οὐκ ὀφείλομεν νομίζειν οὔτε χρυσῷ ἢ ἀργύρῳ* etc., the *ἤ* is co-ordinate with *οὔτε*, a usage of which another example could hardly be found, Mtth. Eurip. VII. 178.

[1] *Οὐ μετενόησαν ἐκ τῶν φόνων αὐτῶν, οὔτε ἐκ τῶν ... οὔτε ἐκ τῆς ... οὔτε ἐκ τῶν* etc. (instead of the regular *οὐ μετεν. οὔτε ἐκ τῶν φόνων οὔτε* etc.) is as allowable as Odyss. 9, 136 ff. *ἵν' οὐ χρεὼ πείσματός ἐστιν, οὔτ' εὐνὰς βαλέειν, οὔτε πρυμνήσι' ἀνάψαι*, or Odyss. 4, 566, see *Klotz*, Devar. 710. A var. in Rev. as above has not been noted.

However, as τε ... ἤ is used (Klotz, Devar. II. 742 sq.), οὔτε ... ἤ may also be allowable. But the other authorities omit οὔτε in this passage.

It is more difficult to say whether or not μήτε, οὔτε can be used after μηδέ, οὐδέ. Almost all recent philologists decide in the
514 negative, see Mtth. II. 1446 (Engelhardt, as above, p. 70; Lehmann, Lucian. III. 615 sq.; Franke II. 18, and others), on the ground that when the stronger expression οὐδέ (Mtth. 1444, 1446) precedes, the weaker οὔτε cannot follow, cf. also Fr. Mr. p. 158.[1] Yet in the various editions of Greek authors there occur many passages in which οὐδέ is followed by an οὔτε (Thuc. 3, 48; see Poppo in loc.; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 2; catapl. 15; Plat. Charm. 171 b.; Aristot. physiogn. 6, p. 148 Franz); they are usually emended, however, commonly with more or less MS. authority. That οὔτε and μήτε cannot be strictly *parallel* with οὐδέ and μηδέ, may hold as a general rule (though the reason alleged does not appear to me decisive); yet, when these particles have nothing to do with οὐδέ (or μηδέ) as a *conjunction*, οὔτε (μήτε) may follow οὐδέ (μηδέ) in the two following cases (cf. also Döderlein in Passow's Lexicon under οὐδέ):

a) When οὐδέ means *ne ... quidem* (Klotz, Devar. 711; cf. 2 Macc. v. 10) or *neither* (also not), or connects the negative clause to which δέ points with a preceding clause.[2] In Gal. i. 12
437 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ ... παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην the common
6th ed. reading is to be retained, if the passage is rendered: *for also I did not receive it. — nor was I taught it*, or *neque enim ego* (for οὐ γάρ) *accepi didicique* (*-ve*), cf. Hoogeveen, doctr. particul. II. 980 sq. See Plat. Charm. 171 b.; Hom. in Cerer. 22 (Hm. emend. p. 39); Lysias orat. 19 p. 157 Steph. The οὐδέ of good Codd. [even Sin.] for οὔτε is probably a correction.

459 b) When the οὔτε (μήτε) following οὐδέ (μηδέ) is not co-ordinate
7th ed. with the latter, but is subordinate to it, e.g. *I harbor no enmity and I do not counterwork the plans of others nor their undertakings*, Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 11 μηδ' ἔπεσθαι μηδὲ πείθεσθαι μήτε στρατηγῷ μήτε ἄλλῳ ἄρχοντι (where, however, the first two words are suspicious), Cyrop. 8, 7, 22 μήποτ' ἀσεβὲς μηδὲν μηδὲ ἀνόσιον μήτε ποιήσητε μήτε βουλεύσητε, Plato, legg. 11, 916 e. The negation

[1] Οὔτε after οὐδέ is upheld by *Bornem.* Xen. A. p. 26; *Hand*, as above, p. 13.

[2] *Hand*, as above: intelligitur, nexum, quem nonnulli grammatici inter οὐδέ et οὔτε intercedere dixerunt, nullum esse, nisi quod οὐ in voc. οὐδέ cum οὔτε cohaereat. Nam si in aliquibus Hom. locis ista vocc. hoc quidem ordine nexa videntur exhiberi, in iis δέ pertinet ad superiora conjungenda. Cf. *Hartung* I. 201; *Klotz* p. 711.

μηδέ is here divided into two members (μήτε ... μήτε) Dem. Callipp. 718 c.; Judith viii. 18; cf. Held, Plut. Timol. p. 433 sq.; Mtth. 1445; Kühner II. 440. Accordingly Acts xxiii. 8 μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, μηδὲ ἄγγελον (μηδὲ εἶναι μήτε ἄγγ.) μήτε πνεῦμα would be admissible, and would find additional support in τὰ 515
ἀμφότερα immediately following.[1] Tdf. has so printed the text in his 2d [and 7th] Leipsic edition. The sentence would be simpler, indeed, with μηδὲ πν., or, as the better Codd. [Sin. also] have it, μήτε ἄγγ. μήτε πν.; and this last has been preferred by Lchm. and Bornem. The more usual reading, however, might easily have been introduced as a correction for the more unusual. In 1 Thess. ii. 3, owing to the notions connected, οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ appears to me more suitable (the better Codd. too [Sin. also] have this reading, and Lchm. has so printed); and in general, I think that in *this* case accurate writers would for the sake of perspicuity use ἤ instead of οὔτε, see § 53, 6, p. 440 sq.

In 1 Cor. iii. 2 the best Codd. [Sin. also], instead of the transcriber's error οὔτε as in the received text, give ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε *ne nunc quidem* (cf. Acts xix. 2; Lucian. Hermot. 7; conscr. hist. 33 and Fr. Mr. p. 157), so in 2 Thess. ii. 2 εἰς τὸ μὴ ταχέως σαλευθῆναι ... μηδὲ θροεῖσθαι μήτε διὰ πνεύματος etc. (Lchm. and Tdf.). In 2 Thess. iii. 8 οὐδέ is the only correct reading. In Luke vii. 9; xii. 27; Acts xvi. 21 Griesb. properly adopted οὐδέ, which should be adopted too in Acts iv. 12. In Jas. iii. 12 recent editors (Lchm. and Tdf. also) give οὔτε ἁλυκὸν γλυκὺ ποιῆσαι ὕδωρ. This reading can only be supported on the assumption that James had in mind as the antecedent member οὔτε δύναται συκῆ ἐλαίας ποιῆσαι etc. — harsh on any view it must be confessed —; otherwise we must read οὐδέ which some Codd. give. [So Cod. Sin. also, but with οὕτως preceding.]

Passages like Luke x. 4 μὴ βαστάζετε βαλλάντιον, μὴ πήραν μηδὲ ὑπο- 438
δήματα (*not ... nor ... neither*), Matt. x. 9 μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσὸν μηδὲ 6th ed.
ἄργυρον μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, μὴ πήραν εἰς ὁδόν, μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα etc., present nothing that is singular.

It may be incidentally remarked further, that the distinction between 460
οὐδέ, μηδέ, and καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή, which is explained by Engelhardt, Plat. Lach. 7th ed.
p. 65, and still more aptly by Franke II. 8 sq. (καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή after affirmative sentences *and not, yet not*, et non, ac non), as it appears to have a

[1] See *Hoogeveen*, doctr. particul. I. 751. *Kühnöl* insists on rendering τὰ ἀμφότερα *tria ista*, but by no means vindicates that rendering by Odyss. 15, 78 ἀμφότερον κῦδός τε καὶ ἀγλαΐη καὶ ὄνειαρ, since the first two words here, united by τε καί, are regarded as a *single* notion. In Acts, as above, were we to read μηδέ, ἀμφότερα still could not mean *tria*; but the writer regards ἄγγ. and πνεῦμα, agreeably to their logical import, as *one* leading conception.

logical foundation, is observable likewise in the N. T., cf. καὶ οὐ Jno. v. 43; vi. 17; vii. 36; Acts xvi. 7; 2 Cor. xiii. 10, καὶ μή Jas. i. 5; iv. 17; 1 Pet. ii. 16; iii. 6; Heb. xiii. 17.

516 For passages in Greek authors which especially illustrate the difference between οὐδέ and οὔτε, see Isocr. Areop. p. 345 οὐκ ἀνωμάλως οὐδὲ ἀτάκτως οὔτε ἐθεράπευον οὔτε ὠργίαζον etc., permut. p. 750 ὥστε μηδένα μοι πώποτε μηδ' ἐν ὀλιγαρχίᾳ μηδ' ἐν δημοκρατίᾳ μήτε ὕβριν μήτε ἀδικίαν ἐγκαλέσαι, Her. 6, 9; Isocr. ep. 8, p. 1016; Xen. Ages. 1, 4; Demosth. Timocr. 481 b. Cf. Mtth. p. 1445.

7. In two parallel propositions, sometimes οὔτε (μήτε) is followed, not by another negative, but by a simple copula (καί or τε), e.g. Jno. iv. 11 οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ, as in Latin *nec haustrum habes et puteus* etc. (Hand, Tursell. IV. 133 sqq.), 3 Jno. 10, cf. Arrian. Al. 4, 7, 6 ἐγὼ οὔτε τὴν ἄγαν ταύτην τιμωρίαν Βήσσου ἐπαινῶ . . . καὶ ὑπαχθῆναι Ἀλέξανδρον ξύμφημι etc., Paus. 1, 6, 5 Δημήτριος οὔτε παντάπασιν ἐξειστήκει Πτολεμαίῳ τῆς χώρας, καί τινας τῶν Αἰγυπτίων λοχήσας διέφθειρεν, Lucian. dial. mar. 14, 1; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 20 (τε is the more frequent, Jacobitz, Lucian. Tox. c. 25; Weber, Demosth. p. 402 sq.) see Hartung, Partik. I. 193; Klotz, Devar. p. 713, 740; Götting. Anzeig. 1831, S. 1188. On the other hand, in Jas. iii. 14 the negation is omitted the second time, or rather affects also the annexed clause: μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας. So also in 2 Cor. xii. 21; Matt. xiii. 15; Mark iv. 12; Jno. xii. 40; Acts xxviii. 27; cf. Sext. Emp. adv. Math. 2, 20; Diod. S. 2, 48; Aelian. anim. 5, 21; Gataker, Advers. miscell. 2, 2, p. 268; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 182; Boissonade, Nicet. p. 390. The converse construction many expositors have asserted is found in Eph. iv. 26 ὀργίζεσθε καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε for μὴ ὀργ. καὶ (μὴ) ἁμαρτ. So in Greek authors (even prose) οὐδέ and οὔτε are frequently used in the second member of a sentence, and have to be supplied in the first, see Schaef. Bos, ellips. p. 777; Hm. Soph. Aj. 239, 616; Döderlein, brachylog. p. 5 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 841. This construction, however, which would be extremely harsh for the prose of the N. T., is not necessary in the preceding passage (especially as it does not run μήτε ἁμαρτ.), see § 43, 2, p. 311 sq. On the other hand, in Luke xviii. 7, according to the accredited reading ὁ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ . . .
439 καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, especially if the latter verb means
6th ed. *delay*, the negative particle would be omitted in the second clause,
461 and merely the interrogative μή *num* would have to be repeated.
7th ed. Bornem. in the sächs. bibl. Studien I. 69.

Οὐδὲ ... δέ Heb. ix. 12 hardly needs a remark, as οὐ ... δέ is of so very frequent occurrence.

8. It has frequently been laid down as a rule, that sentences 517
which contain a single negation followed by ἀλλά (δέ), or in which οὐ (μή) forms an antithesis to a preceding affirmative sentence (Matt. ix. 13 Sept.; Heb. xiii. 9; Luke x. 20), are not always (as e.g. Mark v. 39 τὸ παιδίον οὐκ ἀπέθανεν ἀλλὰ καθεύδει, where the latter thought exactly overturns the first, Matt. ix. 12; x. 34; xv. 11; 2 Cor. xiii. 7) to be understood as purely negative, but (in consequence of a construction which, though Hebraistic, occurs also in Greek prose) must be rendered: *not so much ... as* (non tam ... quam, οὐ τοσοῦτον ... ὅσον Heliod. 10, 3; Xen. Eph. 5, 11, οὐχ οὕτως ... ὡς Dio. Chr. 8, 130, οὐ μᾶλλον ἤ Xen. Hell. 7, 1, 2), or: *not only ... but also*, non solum ... sed etiam,[1] cf. Blackwall, auct. class. sacr. p. 62; Glass. I. 418 sqq.; Wetst. and Kypke ad Matt. ix. 13; Heumann on 1 Cor. x. 23 f.; Kuinoel, Acta p. 177; Haab, Gr. 145 ff.; Bos, ellips. p. 772 sq., and others (Valcken. Opusc. II. 190; ad Dion. H. IV. 2121, 10; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. p. lxix.); e.g. Acts v. 4 οὐκ ἐψεύσω ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ θεῷ *not so much to men* (the apostle Peter), *as to God* etc.; 1 Cor. xv. 10 οὐκ ἐγὼ δὲ (ἐκοπίασα), ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί, Augustine: *non ego solus, sed gratia Dei mecum* (Jno. v. 30);[2] Luke x. 20 μὴ χαίρετε ὅτι ... χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι etc. nolite *tam* propterea laetari ... *quam potius*.

But in the passages from the N. T. referred to this head, when more closely considered, either

[1] The first sense, *non tam ... quam*, is the one by far most commonly assumed in the N. T., as the examples which follow show; and an apparent warrant for it might be found in the fact, that in N. T. Greek the relative negation *non solum ... sed* is frequently expressed, but *non tam ... quam* in point of fact never.

[2] No wonder expositors have been partial to such a weakening of the preceding idiom, since even philologists supposed it necessary to soften a strong expression in passages of the ancients where there was not the slightest occasion. Thus Dion. H. IV. 2111 δόξῃ τὸ ἀνδρεῖον ἐπιτηδεύων οὐκ ἀληθείᾳ is still translated by *Reiske:* te fortitudinis studiosum esse opinione *magis quam* re ipsa. For a similar impropriety, see *Alberti*, observ. p. 71. As to the misapprehension of *Palairet* (obs. p. 236) in reference to Macrob. Saturn. I, 22, see my grammatische Excurse S. 155. Cic. off. 2, 8, 27 also is easily disposed of according to the preceding remarks. Moreover, any one may see in *Glass.* as above, p. 421, how the older Biblical interpreters allowed themselves to be influenced even by *doctrinal* considerations in explaining this idiom. In 1 Pet. i. 12 the weakening of οὐ ... δέ into *non tam ... quam* (see *Schott* even in the latest edition) arises from misunderstanding διακονεῖν. *Flatt* in 1 Cor. vii. 4 wanted to have even the simple οὐ restricted by a μόνον. On 1 Cor. ix. 9 the passage of Philo quoted by expositors throws sufficient light.

440 6th ed. 432 7th ed. 518 a. an *unconditional* negation is plainly intended, as may be gathered from a careful examination of the context: Matt. ix. 13 ἔλεον θέλω καὶ οὐ θυσίαν, where Christ, using the words of the prophet (Hos. vi. 6), *really* wishes to have mercy (a state of heart) put in the place of sacrifices (mere symbols), cf. what follows: οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον καλέσαι δικαίους, ἀλλ' ἁμαρτωλούς; Jno. vii. 16 ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμή, ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με, where Jesus speaks of the *origin* of his doctrine (vss. 15, 17, 18): *my doctrine* (which ye consider mine, cf. vs. 15) *belongs not to me, but to God,* — has for its author not me, but God, (Christ calls it ἡ ἐμὴ διδ. in reference to the opinion of the Jews, who in the words πῶς οὗτος γράμματα οἶδε, μὴ μεμαθηκώς; assumed it to be something acquired by means of study),[1] cf. Jno. v. 30[2]; xii. 44; Jno. vi. 27 ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν μένουσαν εἰς ζωὴν αἰών., ἣν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρ. ὑμῖν δώσει, where Jesus censures the conduct of the people who had come to him *as the Messiah*, and the thought: *not so much for ordinary food as for heavenly* (Kühnöl) would be absurd. As to vs. 26 see Lücke. In 1 Cor. vii. 10 Paul makes a distinction between *the Lord's* injunctions and *his own*, as he does in vs. 12, inverting the order; for he alludes there to Christ's declaration Matt. v. 32. Recent expositors are right. As to 1 Cor. xiv. 22 cf. 23 no doubt can exist; cf. besides, 1 Cor. x. 24 (Schott) and Mey. in loc., Eph. vi. 12; Heb. xiii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 17 and Mey. in loc. Likewise in 2 Cor. vii. 9 χαίρω οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν in the first clause λυπηθῆναι is denied in itself (the thought so far as contained in λυπηθ.) and absolutely, but to be taken up again in the second clause with an added limitation εἰς μετάνοιαν. So in *non bonus sed optimus* (see the note below), *non* cancels *good* (in the positive) (*good* he is not), in order straightway to put in its place the only correct term *optimus*, (which of course comprehends the *bonus* also). Or,

b. in other passages, the absolute negation is on *rhetorical*

[1] *Bengel: non est mea,* non ullo modo *discendi* labore parta.

[2] Similar to this would be to say e.g. of a biblical expositor abounding in ancient quotations, *Thy learning is not thy learning, but Wetstein's.* The first *thy learning* is put only problematically; and to infer from it that the speaker means actually to ascribe to the party concerned (that) learning in *some degree* or in *a certain respect,* is an inference purely *grammatical* not *logical. Hm.* Eurip. Alcest. p. 29 had already glanced at *non bonus sed optimus* (*Fr.* diss. in 2 Cor. II. p. 162). Of a similar kind are the passages cited by *Heumann* as above: Cic. Arch. 4, 8 se non interfuisse sed egisse, and Vell Pat. 2, 13 vir non saeculi sui sed omnis aevi optimus. Cf. also 2 Cor. vii. 9.

grounds employed instead of a conditional (relative), not for the purpose of really (logically) cancelling the first conception, but in order to direct undivided attention to the second, so that the first 519
may comparatively disappear (cf. Mey. on Acts v. 4) : 1 Thess. iv. 8 (Schott) *rejecteth not man, but God.*[1] Of course he rejects 463
the apostle also, who announces the divine truth ; but the inten- 7th ed
tion was to present to the mind with full force the fact, that it is 441
properly God, as the real author of the truth announced, who is 6th ed.
rejected. The force of the thought is immediately impaired if rendered : *he rejects not so much man as God.* To give such a translation would be like diluting e.g. an asyndeton (the nature of which also is rhetorical) by subjoining a copula. Therefore it appears to me that *οὐκ . . . ἀλλά*, when it logically means *non tam . . . quam*, is always a part of the rhetorical coloring of the composition, and for that reason is to be preserved in the translation (as is done by all good translators). The speaker has chosen *this* negative *designedly*, and the expression is not to be judged of grammatically merely. Whether, however, such is actually the case, is to be determined not according to the impressions of the interpreter, but by the context and the nature of the connected thoughts. In this way the following passages are to be treated : Matt. x. 20 (Schott) *οὐχ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν*, Mark ix. 37 (Schott) *ὃς ἐὰν ἐμὲ δέξηται, οὐκ ἐμὲ δέχεται, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με*, 1 Cor. xv. 10 *περισσότερον αὐτῶν πάντων ἐκοπίασα· οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σὺν ἐμοί*, Jno. xii. 44 *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ πιστεύει εἰς ἐμέ, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με*, Acts v. 4 (cf. Plutarch. apophth. Lac. 41 ; see Duker, Thuc. 4, 92) ; Luke x. 20 (where many MSS. insert a *μᾶλλον* after *δέ*) ; 2 Cor. ii. 5 (Schott). As to Luke xiv. 12 f. see Bornem. and de Wette in loc.[2]

[1] Cf. Demosth. Euerg. 684 b. *ἡγησαμένη ὑβρίσθαι οὐκ ἐμέ* (but he had been abused actually) *ἀλλ' ἑαυτὴν* (*τὴν βουλὴν*) *καὶ τὸν δῆμον τὸν ψηφισάμενον* etc., Aesop. 148, 2 *οὐ σύ με λοιδορεῖς, ἀλλ' ὁ πύργος, ἐν ᾧ ἵστασαι.* *Klotz*, Devar. p. 9 : *οὐκ ἐκινδύνευσεν, ἀλλ' ἔπαθεν* est : *non periclitatus sed passus est*, quibus verbis hoc significatur : non dico istum periclitatum esse sed passum, ita ut, cum ille dicatur passus esse, jam ne cogitetur quidem de eo, quod priori membro dictum est.

[2] Against this view, propounded in the first edition of this work in accordance with the remarks of *de Wette* (A. L.-Z. 1816 nr. 41 S. 321) and those of a critic in the Theol. Annal. 1816 S. 873, *Fr.* dissert. in 2 Cor. II. 162 sq. declared himself. His objections were examined by *Beyer* in the n. krit. Journ. d Theol. 3 B. 1 St. ; but *Fr.* discussed the subject anew in his 2d excursus on Mr. p. 773 sq. I had written the above in substance before I received this excursus, and it agrees essentially with the opinion expressed in the second edition of this Grammar S. 177, and in my grammat. Excurse S. 155.

520 When (οὐ) μὴ ... ἀλλὰ καί are correlative, as in Phil. ii. 4 μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν
ἕκαστος σκοποῦντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἑτέρων ἕκαστος, the original plan of the
434 sentence intended οὐ ... ἀλλά, and καί was introduced because the writer
7th ed. on reaching the second member determined to soften and qualify the
442 thought. Passages of a similar sort are not unfrequent in Greek authors,
8th ed. see Fr. Exc. 2 ad Mr. p. 788; cf. Thuc. ed. Poppo III. III. 300, (on the Latin *non ... sed etiam* or *quoque*, see Ramshorn S. 535 f.; Kritz, Vell. Pat. p. 157 f.). The converse is οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλά (without καί, see Lehmann, Lucian. II. 551), when the writer drops μόνον, and, instead of a thought parallel to the first, subjoins one that is stronger (which usually includes the former), see Stallb. Plat. symp. p. 115; Fr. as above, 786 ff. and Klotz, Devar. p. 9 sq. So Acts xix. 26 ὅτι οὐ μόνον Ἐφέσου, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν πάσης τῆς Ἀσίας ὁ Παῦλος οὗτος πείσας μετέστησεν ἱκανὸν ὄχλον *that he not only at Ephesus, but in all Asia* etc., where strict propriety required: *but also in other places*, cf. 1 Jno. v. 6 οὐκ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ τῷ αἵματι. On the Lat. *non solum* (*modo*) ... *sed*, see Hand, Tursell. IV. 282 sqq.; Kritz, Sallust. Cat. p. 80. The second member is heightened in a different way in Phil. ii. 12; in 1 Tim. v. 23 μηκέτι ὑδροπότει, ἀλλ' οἴνῳ ὀλίγῳ χρῶ is to be rendered, *Be no longer a water-drinker* (ὑδροποτεῖν cf. Her. 1, 71; Athen. 1. 168), *but use a little wine*; ὑδροποτεῖν differs from ὕδωρ πίνειν, and signifies *to be a water-drinker* i.e. to drink water usually and exclusively. One who uses *a little* wine ceases of course to be a water-drinker in this sense, and it is quite unnecessary here to supply μόνον. Matthies in loc. is not accurate.

9. Two negatives employed together in *one* principal clause[1] (Klotz, Devar. p. 695 sqq.; E. Lieberkühn, de negationum graec. cumulatione. Jen. 1849. 4to.), either

a. Produce an affirmation, Acts iv. 20 οὐ δυνάμεθα ἡμεῖς, ἃ εἴδομεν καὶ ἠκούσαμεν, μὴ λαλεῖν, non possumus ... non dicere, i.e. we *must* declare (cf. Aristoph. ran. 42 οὗτοι μὰ τὴν Δήμητρα δύναμαι μὴ γελᾶν), 1 Cor. xii. 15 οὐ παρὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος *it is still, for all that, of the body* (belongs to it). In the first passage the particles of negation belong to different verbs (δυνάμεθα is first denied and then λαλεῖν), in Syriac ; in the last, οὐκ ἔστιν constitutes a single idea which is negatived by the first οὐ, — the *not belonging to the body* is denied, (cf. οὐκ εἶναι used thus in a nega-

Meyer and *BCrusius* have decidedly agreed with me in the various passages adduced above; but I take especial pleasure in the remarks of my acute colleague *Klotz* ad Devar. p. 9 sq. in support of my view. As to *non ... sed*, cf. *Kritz*, Sallust. Jug. p. 533; *Hand*, Tur. IV. 271.

[1] The two negatives equivalent to an affirmative in Rom. xv. 18, which occur in two different clauses blended by attraction, require no special notice.

tive clause in Demosth. Androt. 420 c.; Aelian. 12, 36). See besides, Matt. xxv. 9 text. rec. Cf. Poppo, Thuc. III. IV. 711; Mtth. II. 1449. Or, 521

b. They both produce but a *single* negation (which is the more frequent case), and serve (originally) only to make the principal negation which would have sufficed alone more distinct and forcible, and to impart to the sentence a negative character throughout:[1] Jno. xv. 5 *χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν non potestis facere quidquam*, i.e. *nihil* pot. fac. (Dem. Callip. 718 c.), 2 Cor. xi. 8 *παρὼν . . . οὐ κατενάρκησα οὐδενός*, Acts xxv. 24 *ἐπιβοῶντες μὴ δεῖν αὐτὸν ζῆν μηκέτι*, Mark xi. 14 *μηκέτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἐκ σοῦ μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγῃ*, 1 Cor. i. 7 *ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι*, Matt. xxii. 16; Mark i. 44; v. 37; vii. 12; ix. 8; xii. 34; xv. 4 f.; Matt. xxiv. 21; Luke iv. 2; viii. 43 (51 var.); x. 19; xx. 40; xxii. 16; Jno. iii. 27; v. 30; vi. 63; ix. 33; xvi. 23 f.; xix. 41; Acts viii. 16, 39; Rom. xiii. 8; 1 Cor. viii. 2 (var.); 2 Cor. vi. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 6; 1 Jno. i. 5; Rev. xviii. 4, 11, 14, etc.[2] So in particular where the notion *every*, *always*, *every time*, *everywhere*, is added to the negative clause for its necessary or rhetorical amplification (Böckh, nott. Pind. p. 418 sq.),[3] or where the negation is decomposed, Matt. xii. 32 *οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι*.[4] In this way a single sentence may contain a series of negatives: Luke xxiii. 53 *οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδέπω οὐδεὶς κείμενος*, Mark v. 3 (cf. Aelian. anim. 11, 31 *ὡς οὐδεπώποτε οὐδένα οὐδὲν ἀδικήσας*, Plat. Parmen. 166 a. *ὅτι τἄλλα τῶν μὴ ὄντων οὐδενὶ οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς οὐδεμίαν κοινωνίαν ἔχει*, Phaed. 78 d.; Her. 2, 39 *οὐδὲ ἄλλου οὐδενὸς ἐμψύχου κεφαλῆς γεύσεται Αἰγυπτίων οὐδείς*, Lysias pro Mantith. 10; Xenoph. A. 2, 4, 23; Plat. Phil. 29 b. and soph. 249 b.; Lucian. chronol. 13; Dio C. 635, 40; 402, 35; 422, 24); see Wyttenb. Plat. Phaed. p. 199; Ast, Plat. polit. p. 541; Boisson. Philostr. Her. p. 446 and Nicet. p. 243, especially also Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 13; 465 7th ed. 443 6th ed

[1] As in popular German; yet the accumulation of negatives is genuine German, and has been expelled from the language of the educated only through the influence of the Latin, which so thoroughly pervades our literary culture. As to Latin, see *Jani*, ars poet. lat. p. 236 sq.

[2] In the Sept. cf. Gen. xlv. 1; Num. xvi. 15; Exod. x. 23; Deut. xxxiv. 6; Josh. ii. 11; 1 Sam. xii. 4, especially Hos. iv. 4 *ὅπως μηδεὶς μήτε δικάζηται μήτε ἐλέγχῃ μηδείς*. Transcribers have in such sentences sometimes omitted a negative, see *Fr.* Mr. p. 107.

[3] But this mode of expression is not always employed, cf. Acts x. 14 *οὐδέποτε ἔφαγον πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον* (without var.), 1 Jno. iv. 12.

[4] *Klotz*, Devar. II. 698: in hac enuntiatione ita repetita est negatio, quod unumquodque orationis membrum, quia eo amplificabatur sententia, quasi per se stare videbatur.

Gayl. p. 382 sq. When *οὐδέ ne ... quidem* is employed, it is usual
522 in Greek to prefix another negative to the verb (cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 279; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 460). So Luke xviii. 13 *οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπᾶραι.*

In 1 Cor. vi. 10, after several antecedent partitive clauses (*οὔτε, οὔτε, οὐ, οὐ*), the negative is once more repeated for the sake of perspicuity with
466 the predicate *βασιλείαν θεοῦ οὐ κληρονομήσουσι.* The best Codd., how-
7th ed. ever, [Sin. also] omit it, and Lchm. has expunged it. In Rev. xxi. 4 *ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, οὔτε πένθος οὔτε κραυγὴ οὔτε πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι,* the writer might also without hesitation have dispensed with the second *οὐ.*
444 What comes nearest, however, is Aesch. Ctesiph. 285 b. *οὐδέ γε ὁ πονηρὸς*
6th ed. *οὐκ ἄν ποτε γένοιτο δημοσίᾳ χρηστός*, see Bremi in loc. (c. 77), cf. also Plat. rep. 4, 426 b. and Hm. Soph. Antig. as above. On the other hand, *οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι οὔτε πένθος* etc. would be quite according to rule. In Acts xxvi. 26 the text. rec. gives *λανθάνειν αὐτόν τι τούτων οὐ πείθομαι οὐδέν*; but the better Codd. omit either *οὐδέν* or *τι.* [Yet *οὐθέν with τι* is found in Cod. Sin.*]

On the pleonasm of *μή* after verbs in which the idea of negation is already contained, see § 65, 2, p. 604.

Note. A peculiar kind of negation is formed with *εἰ* in oaths by virtue of an aposiopesis of the apodosis; as, Mark viii. 12 *ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, εἰ δοθήσεται τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ σημεῖον* i.e. *no* sign will be given; Heb. iii. 11; iv. 3 Sept. *ὤμοσα, εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου.* This is an imitation of the Hebrew אִם (cf. Gen. xiv. 23; Deut. i. 35; 1 Kings i. 51; ii. 8; 2 Kings iii. 14, etc.), and a form of imprecation must always be supplied as the apodosis: in the last passage, *then will I not live, not be Jehovah;* in passages where the speaker is a man, *so may God punish me* (cf. 1 Sam. iii. 17; 2 Sam. iii. 35), *then will I not live*, and the like; Ewald krit. Gr. 661, (cf. Aristoph. equit. 698 f. *εἰ μὴ σ' ἐκφάγω ... οὐδέποτε βιώσομαι*, Cic. fam. 9, 15, 7 *moriar*, si habeo). Ἐάν is thus used in Neh. xiii. 25; Song of Sol. ii. 7; iii. 5 Sept. Of the opposite, *ἐὰν μή* or *εἰ μή* (affirmatively), no instance occurs in the N. T. (cf. Ezek. xvii. 19), for most unwarrantably has Haab S. 226 referred to this head Mark x. 30; 2 Thess. ii. 3.

§ 56. CONSTRUCTION OF NEGATIVE PARTICLES.

1. The (subjective) negative *μή ne* (with its compounds) is used in *independent* sentences to express a negative wish or a warning, and is construed

523 a. With the Optative (Aor.) — the mood which would be used also without the negation — when a negative wish is expressed (Franke I. 27), e.g. in the frequently recurring *μὴ γένοιτο* Luke xx. 16; Rom. iii. 6; ix. 14; Gal. ii. 17 (Sturz, dial. Alex. 204 sq.),

and in μὴ αὐτοῖς λογισθείη 2 Tim. iv. 16 (Plat. legg. 11, 918 d.). So also μηκέτι, according to the text. rec., Mark xi. 14 μηκέτι ἐκ σοῦ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μηδεὶς καρπὸν φάγοι *may no one ever again* etc. The Subjunctive φάγῃ, however, would here be more appropriate in the mouth of Christ, — if it only had more external authority in its favor. Besides, see Gayler p. 76 sqq. 82.

b. When a warning is expressed, it is construed α) sometimes with the Imperative Present, usually where something permanent and which a person is already doing is to be indicated (Hm. Vig. 809), Matt. vi. 19 μὴ θησαυρίζετε ὑμῖν, vii. 1 μὴ κρίνετε, Jno. v. 14 μηκέτι ἁμάρτανε, cf. Matt. xxiv. 6,[1] 17; Jno. xiv. 1; xix. 21; Mark xiii. 7, 11; Rom. xi. 18; Eph. iv. 28; 1 Tim. v. 23; 1 Pet. iv. 12; β) sometimes with the Subjunctive Aorist, when something transient, which should not be begun at all, is to be expressed (Hm. as above), Luke vi. 29 ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς, Matt. x. 34 μὴ νομίσητε (do not conceive), ὅτι ἦλθον etc., vi. 13; Luke xvii. 23; Acts xvi. 28. So in legislative prohibitions, Matt. vi. 7; Mark x. 19; Col. ii. 21, where not the repetition or continuation, but the action itself (though done but once) is interdicted, and absolutely. The Aor. Imperat., which specially has this signification, and is not at all rare in later writers (Gayl. p. 64),[2] does not occur in the N. T. (and is doubtful in the Sept. also). On the other hand, the Pres. Imperat. also is often used in reference to what should not be begun at all (Hm. as above, Franke I. 30); cf. Matt. ix. 30; Eph. v. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22; 1 Jno. iii. 7. In general, see Hm. de praeceptis Atticistar. p. 4 sqq. (Opusc. I. 270 sqq.); cf. Soph. Aj. p. 163; Bhdy. 393 f.; Franke I. 28 sqq. The Imperat. and Subjunctive are both employed in one sentence in Luke x. 4. 467 7th ed. 445 6th ed.

The Pres. Imperat. is also construed with μή in Rom. xiii. 8 μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε; for owing to the subjective negatives ὀφείλ. cannot be taken as an Indicative. Reiche's observations on the other side are a strange mixture of obscurity and half-truth. And if he means to say that the subjective negatives are used in the same way in some of the passages adduced by Wetstein, he is very much mistaken; for in these passages the Inf. or Participle is employed, both of which regularly take μή. 524

As to οὐ with the Fut. Indic., partly in passages from the O. T. law, as

[1] There must here be a comma after ὁρᾶτε, as *H. Stephanus* correctly remarked in the preface to his edition of the N. T. of 1576. If ὁρᾶτε μή be immediately connected, θροῆσθε must be substituted for θροεῖσθε. *Tdf.* [in his 2d ed.] has not attended to this. [In his 1st ed. and 7th he has it correctly, also in his edd. man.]

[2] Cf. *Bremi*, excurs. 12 ad Lys. p. 452 sqq.

Matt. v. 21 οὐ φονεύσεις, xix. 18; Acts xxiii. 5; Rom. xiii. 9, and partly in the N. T. style itself, Matt. vi. 5 οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὥσπερ οἱ ὑποκριταί, where μή with the Subjunctive might have been expected, cf. § 43, 5. Not unlike this is Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 34; see Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 204; Franke I. 24. (On μή with the Fut. Indic. in a mildly prohibitive sense, see Weber, Demosth. p. 369.)

When μή in a prohibitive sense is joined with the *third* Person (as frequently in laws, see Franke, as above, p. 32), the Imperat. is used (always in the N. T.), not the Subjunctive (Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 163): the *Present* Imper. when what is forbidden has already commenced, and the *Aorist* Imper. when something which has not
468 yet commenced is to be avoided (in future also); as, Rom. vi. 12 μὴ
7th ed. οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι, xiv. 16; 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13; Col. ii. 16; 1 Tim. vi. 2; Jas. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 8; on the other hand Matt. vi. 3 μὴ γνώτω ἡ ἀριστερά σου etc., xxiv. 18 μὴ ἐπιστρεψάτω ὀπίσω, Mark xiii. 15 μὴ καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν (probably also in Matt. xxiv. 17 according to good Codd. [Sin. also], where the text. rec. has καταβαινέτω). Cf. Xen. C. 7, 5, 73; 8, 7, 26; Aeschin. Ctes. 282 c.; Mtth. II. 1157; Kühner
446 II. 113. (Instances from the Sept., therefore, are not needed
6th ed. here; otherwise, besides Deut. xxxiii. 6 and 1 Sam. xvii. 32, many could be found, as Josh. vii. 3; 1 Sam. xxv. 25; 2 Sam. i. 21; Judges vi. 39.)

If a dehortation in the 1st Pers. (Plur.) is to be expressed, μή takes the Subjunctive, and either the Pres. or the Aor. according to the distinction indicated above (Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 162), e.g. Jno. xix. 24 μὴ σχίσωμεν, but 1 Jno. iii. 18 μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν λόγῳ (as some were doing), Gal. vi. 9; 1 Thess. v. 6; Rom. xiv. 13; 1 Cor. x. 8. In Gal. v. 26 the Codd. vary, some having μὴ γινώμεθα κενόδοξοι (text. rec.), others γενώμεθα. The better [Sin. also] favor the former, (and Lchm. and Tdf. have so printed). The apostle may mean to reprove a failing already existing in the churches, as seems probable also from what precedes. Mey. takes a different view. From Greek authors, see evidence for the use of the 1st Pers. Plur. Subj. in Gayler 72 sq.

2. In *dependent* clauses μή (μήπως, μήποτε etc.) is used,
525 a. In the sense of *in order that not* (for which ἵνα μή is more commonly employed), with the Subjunctive after Pres. and Impera. 1 Cor. ix. 27 ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα . . . μήπως . . . ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι, 2 Cor. ii. 7; xii. 6; Matt. v. 25; xv. 32; Luke xii. 58 and frequently; with the Optative after a Preterite, Acts xxvii. 42 τῶν

στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσι, μή τις ἐκκολυμβήσας διαφύγοι, but good Codd. [Sin. also] have here διαφύγῃ, which Lchm. and Tdf. have adopted (Bhdy. 401; Krü. 168). The latter reading, however, may be a correction or an error of transcribers. The Subj. is also used in the O. T. quotation Matt. xiii. 15; Acts xxviii. 27, where, however, as a *permanent* result is meant, it is less questionable. The Indic. Fut. (along with a Subj. Aor.) Mark iv. 12 Sept. μήποτε ἐπιστρέψωσι καὶ ἀφεθήσεται (according to good Codd.) [as also the Fut. βληθήσῃ Matt. v. 25] it is not necessary to regard as likewise dependent on μήποτε, though even then the Fut. would be quite proper, see Fr. This applies to ἰάσομαι Acts xxviii. 27 (Born. ἰάσωμαι) cf. Luke xiv. 8 f. In Matt. vii. 6 Lchm. and Tdf. read μήποτε καταπατήσουσιν, where Griesb. and Scholz have not noted any var.

b. In the sense of *that not, lest*, after ὅρα, βλέπε or φοβοῦμαι, and the like (Hm. Vig. 797; Rost, Gr. 650 f.). In this connection the particle is followed

α) by the Indicative, when the suspicion (apprehension) that something is, will be, or has been, a matter of fact, is also expressed: *Present* Indic. Luke xi. 35 σκόπει, μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν (Hm. Soph. Aj. 272 μὴ ἐστί verentis quidem est ne quid nunc sit, sed indicantis simul, putare se ita esse, ut veretur, 469
cf. Gayl. 317 sq.); Protev. Jacobi 14[1]; *Future* Indic. Col. ii. 8 7th ed.
βλέπετε, μή τις ἔσται ὑμᾶς ὁ συλαγωγῶν ne futurus sit, ne existat, qui etc. Heb. iii. 12; Mark xiv. 2; Her. 3, 36; Plat. Cratyl. 393 c.; Achill. Tat. 6, 2 (p. 837 Jac.); Xen. C. 4, 1, 18 etc. (cf. Stallb. 447
Plat. rep. I. 336); *Preterite* Indic. after a Pres. Gal. iv. 11 φοβοῦμαι 6th ed.
ὑμᾶς, μήπως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα (may have labored), see Hm. Eurip. Med. p. 356; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 135; Stallb. Plat. Menon p. 98 sqq.; 526
cf. Thuc. 3, 53; Plato, Lys. 218 d.; Diog. L. 6, 5; Lucian. Piscat. 15 (Job i. 5), see Gayl. 317, 320.

β) by the Subjunctive (Gayl. 323 sqq.), when the object of a

[1] We cannot with de Wette pronounce this acceptation inappropriate on the ground that "simply a general warning is here expressed." That is just the question. An injunction to examine carefully lest such might be the case, Jesus might certainly give to his contemporaries, according to the assumption elsewhere made in the N. T. respecting their predominant religious character; and this injunction is in reality general. Let every one take care lest the second of the cases mentioned in vs. 34 should apply to him. The apprehension that Jesus would thus be countenancing the doctrine of the complete depravation of man's reason is groundless; and *Niemeyer* (Hall. Pred.-Journ. 1832. Nov.) should not have been induced by such apprehension to take the Indicative for the Subjunctive, — an interpretation which he supports, moreover, by passages of a totally different nature.

mere apprehension, which may perhaps prove groundless, is indicated: by the *Present* Subj. Heb. xii. 15 Sept. ἐπισκοποῦντες . . . μή τις ῥίζα πικρίας . . . ἐνοχλῇ (Hm. Soph. Aj. 272 μὴ ᾖ verentis est, ne quid nunc sit, simulque nescire se utrum sit nec ne significantis); usually by the *Aorist* Subj. in reference to something still future, Matt. xxiv. 4 βλέπετε, μή τις ὑμᾶς πλανήσῃ, 2 Cor. xi. 3 φοβοῦμαι, μήπως . . . φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν, xii. 20; Luke xxi. 8; Acts xiii. 40; 1 Cor. viii. 9; x. 12. The same mood is employed in narration after a Pret. Acts xxiii. 10 εὐλαβηθεὶς μὴ διασπασθῇ . . . ἐκέλευσε, xxvii. 17, 29, as after words of *fearing* (where the fear appears to be well founded, Rost S. 650) even in the best Greek prose authors, Xen. A. 1, 8, 24 Κῦρος δείσας, μὴ ὄπισθεν γενόμενος κατακόψῃ τὸ Ἑλληνικόν, Cyr. 4, 5, 48 πολὺν φόβον ἡμῖν παρείχετε, μή τι πάθητε, Lysias caed. Eratosth. 44 ὃ ἐγὼ δεδιὼς μή τις πύθηται ἐπεθύμουν αὐτὸν ἀπολέσαι, cf. also Thuc. 2, 101; Plato, Euthyd. 288 b.; Herod. 4, 1, 3; 6, 1, 11; see Mtth. II. 1189; Bornem. Xen. sympos. p. 70; Gayl. 324 f. The Indic. Fut. and Subjunct. are connected in 2 Cor. xii. 20 f. φοβοῦμαι, μήπως οὐχ οἵους θέλω εὕρω ὑμᾶς κἀγὼ εὑρεθῶ ὑμῖν . . . μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντος μου ταπεινώσει με ὁ θεός etc.

In this way we must judge of elliptical passages also (Gayl. 327), such
470 as Matt. xxv. 9 μήποτε οὐκ ἀρκέσῃ ἡμῖν καὶ ὑμῖν *lest there be not enough*, i.e.
7th ed. it is to be feared *that there may not be enough* (according to the text. rec., where, however, recent critics read μήποτε οὐ μὴ ἀρκέσῃ, though without decidedly preponderant authority; and then μήποτε is taken by itself: *no, in no wise*). Rom. xi. 21 εἰ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται (far better supported than φείσηται) *if God has not spared*, (I fear and presume) *that he will not spare thee also*, ne tibi quoque non sit parciturus, cf. Gen. xxiv. 39.

In Gal. ii. 2 ἀνέβην . . . ἀνεθέμην . . . μήπως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, Fr. (Conject. I. note, p. 50) considered the translation ne operam meam luderem aut lusissem faulty in two respects: because instead of τρέχω (after a Preterite) the Optative was to be expected; while the Indic.
448 ἔδραμον here would mean, what the apostle cannot have intended to say,
6th ed. that he *had labored* in vain. Hence Fr. took the words as a direct question: num frustra operam meam in evangelium insumo an insumsi? He himself,
527 however, afterwards felt that this explanation is forced, and in the Opuscula Fritzschiorum p. 173 sq. gave a different rendering. The difficulty in regard to τρέχω entirely disappears, so far as the N. T. is concerned; indeed, the Pres. Subj.[1] is even appropriate, as Paul is speaking of apos-

[1] That τρέχω is Indicative [as is assumed again by *Bttm.* Gramm. des N. T. Sprachgebr. S. 303 and even *Mey.* Aufl. 4] *Usteri* and *Schott* inferred from the fact that ἔδραμον

tolic activity, still *continued*. And the Pret. Indic. ἔδραμον would be justified by the assumption that Paul gave to the whole sentence the same turn of expression that he would have employed, had he uttered the words in a direct form: *in order that I run not or have run* (for *might run*, or *might have run*), cf. above, p. 288. Still simpler, however, is the interpretation now adopted by Fr., who takes the Preterite in a hypothetical sense, cf. Mtth. II. 1185; Hm. de partic. ἄν p. 54: ne forte frustra *cucurrissem* (which might easily have been the case, had I not propounded my doctrine in Jerusalem). But of course, it is not allowable to refer ἀνεθέμην (as Fr. does) to an intention of Paul to instruct himself (for not the mere exposition of his views could have secured him from *having run in vain*, but only the assent of the apostles); on the contrary, Paul must have been satisfied in his own mind that his views were correct, and only have designed to obtain the very important declaration of the apostles in his favor, without which his apostolic labors for the present and the past would have been fruitless, see de Wette in loc.

In 1 Thess. iii. 5 μήπως is construed with both Indic. and Subjunct.: ἔπεμψα εἰς τὸ γνῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν, μήπως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων καὶ εἰς κενὸν γένηται ὁ κόπος ἡμῶν *I sent to ascertain your faith*, (fearing) *lest haply the tempter have tempted you, and my labor be fruitless*. The different moods here are obviously justifiable. The temptation (to waver 471
in faith) might have already taken place; but whether the apostle's labor 7th ed.
had been rendered fruitless by it depended on the result of the temptation, as yet not known to him, and might be dreaded as impending. Fr.'s interpretation (Opusc. Fritzschior. p. 176): ut ... cognoscerem, *an forte* Satanas vos tentasset et *ne forte* labores mei irriti essent, appears to me harsh, as μήπως would thus be taken in two senses. And I can by no means admit that according to my interpretation the Fut. γενήσεται would be required instead of γένηται. On the contrary, the Fut. denoting an apprehension which cannot be verified, and in any event will not be verified at some definite future time, would be far too explicit. See also Hm. Soph. Aj. p. 48 and partic. ἄν p. 126 sq.; Mtth. II. 1186.

Note. Verbs of *fearing* are regularly followed by the simple μή, μήπως, etc. not by ἵνα μή: hence in Acts v. 26 ἵνα μὴ λιθασθῶσιν must not be connected with ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν, as is done by most expositors (even Mey.); but it is dependent, rather, on ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς οὐ μετὰ βίας, and the 449
words ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν are to be considered as parenthetical. 6th ed.

3. The intensive οὐ μή (in reference to what *in no wise* will 528
or should take place)[1] is construed sometimes, and indeed most

follows; forgetting that two different moods, according to different conceptions, may be and sometimes are connected with one and the same particle. (See the passage to be quoted immediately: 1 Thess. iii. 5.)

[1] Thus οὐ μή regularly refers to the future (Matt. xxiv. 21 οἵα οὐ γέγονεν ... οὐδ' οὐ μὴ γένηται). Moreover, it is now the prevalent opinion of scholars, that this idiom

frequently, with the Subjunct. Aorist, sometimes with the Subjunct. Present (Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 51, see below), and sometimes also with the Indic. Fut. (Bengel on Matt. v. 18 is mistaken), see Ast, Plat. polit. p. 365; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 36 sq.; Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 409 sqq.; Gayl. p. 430 sqq. The difference between the Subj. Aor. and the Fut. Indic. (which alone occur in the N. T.) is defined by Hm. Soph. Oed. Col. ver. 853 thus: *Conjunctivo Aor.* locus est aut in eo, quod jam actum est (see, however, Ellendt as above, p. 411 sq.), aut in re incerti temporis, sed semel vel brevi
472 temporis momento agenda; *Futuri* vero usus, quem ipsa verbi
7th ed. forma nonnisi in rebus futuris versari ostendit, ad ea pertinet, quae aut diuturniora aliquando eventura indicare volumus aut non aliquo quocunque, sed remotiore aliquo tempore dicimus futura esse. The inquiry whether this distinction is observed in the N. T., is rendered difficult by the variations of MSS., of which, in many passages, some have the Indic. Fut., and some the Aor. Subj. So far as can be ascertained by the present apparatus of various readings, the Subj. is established in Matt. v. 18, 20, 26; x. 23; xviii. 3; xxiii. 39; Mark xiii. 2, 19, 30; Luke vi. 37; xii. 59; xiii. 35; xviii. 17, 30; xxi. 18; Jno. viii. 51; x. 28; xi. 26, 56; 1 Thess. iv. 15; 1 Cor. viii. 13; 2 Pet. i. 10; Rev. ii. 11; iii. 3, 12; xviii. 7, 21 f.; xxi. 25, 27. There is a preponderance of evidence for the Subj. in Matt. xvi. 28; xxvi. 35; Mark ix. 41; xvi. 18; Luke i. 15; ix. 27; xviii. 7, 30; xxii. 68; Jno. vi. 35;
529 viii. 12, 52; xiii. 8; Rom. iv. 8; Gal. v. 16; 1 Thess. v. 3. There is at least as much evidence for the Subj. as for the Fut. in Mark xiv. 31; Luke xxi. 33; Matt. xv. 5; xxiv. 35; Gal. iv. 30; Heb. x. 17; Rev. ix. 6 (xviii. 14).[1] The authorities decidedly favor

is to be considered as elliptical: *οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ* for *οὐ δέδοικα* or *οὐ φόβος, οὐ δέος ἐστί* (there is no fear) *μὴ π.* see *Ast*, Plat. polit. p. 365; *Matthiae*, Eurip. Hippol. p. 24; Sprachl. II. 1174; *Hm.* Soph. Oed. C. 1028; *Hartung* II. 156. This involves, indeed, the assumption that the Greeks lost sight of the origin of the expression; for in many passages "there is no *fear* that" is not appropriate, (in the N. T. Matt. v. 20; xviii. 3; Luke xxii. 16; Jno. iv. 48). Earlier *Hm.* (Eurip. Med. p. 390 sq.) had explained the phrase differently, cf. also *Gayl.* p. 402. The connective *οὐδὲ μή* (*καὶ οὐ μή*) occurs in the N. T. only in Rev. vii. 16 (var.), but frequently in the Sept. e.g. Exod. xxii. 21; xxiii. 13; Josh. xxiii. 7; and *οὐδείς μή* in Wisd. i. 8. Generally, *οὐ μή* is of very frequent occurrence in the Sept., and its prevalence may probably be referred to that effort after expressiveness, characteristic of the later language. The instances have been collected by *Gayl.* p. 441 sqq. It is not the fact, however, that in the N. T. (*Hitzig*, Joh. Marc. S. 106) Mark and the Revelation display a predilection for *οὐ μή*. A concordance will prove the contrary.

[1] It must not be overlooked that sometimes the Future form may be occasioned in MSS. by a preceding or following Future, as in Jno. viii. 12 *οὐ μὴ περιπατήσει . . . ἀλλ' ἕξει.*

the Fut. in Luke x. 19; xxii. 34; Jno. iv. 14; x. 5. The Fut. is established (without var.) in Matt. xvi. 22 *οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο* (absit) ne tibi accidat hoc. Accordingly the Subj. is indisputably predominant in the N. T. (cf. Lob. Phryn. p. 722 sq.), and this is no less the case in Greek authors, see Hartung, Partik. II. 156 f. Hermann's rule on the whole does not apply to the N. T.; for although several passages might be interpreted in accordance with it, yet others in turn are at variance with it, and the Aor. is employed where the Fut. should have been used, as e.g. 1 Thess. iv. 15 *ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας*, where the point of time is very definitely in mind viz. *on the day of Christ's second coming;* and Heb. viii. 11, where in *οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν* there is reference to a precise time (the Messianic period, vs. 10), and duration also is indicated, cf. Rev. xxi. 25. In fact, the Subj. Aor. in the sense of the Future had become usual in later Greek, cf. Lob. as above, p. 723; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 57. Mdv. also S. 127 discovers no perceptible difference between the Fut. and the Aor. in this construction. (Gayl. 440 sqq. has catalogued all the passages in the Sept. where *οὐ μή* occurs.) 450 6th ed.

The statement of Dawes, however, which recognizes no difference of meaning between the Aor. and Fut. in this construction, but as respects the former allows only the 2d Aor. Act. (and Mid.) in Greek texts, has been almost universally rejected (see Mtth. II. 1175 f.; Stallb. Plat. rep. II. 343; on the other hand, Bhdy. 402 f.), and cannot be applied to the N. T., where the 1st Aor. is as frequent as the 2d Aor. even in verbs that have a 2d Aor. in common use, (var. see Rev. xviii. 14). 473 7th ed.

Sometimes *οὐ μή* is followed, according to a few Codd., by a *Present* Indic., viz. in Jno. iv. 48 *ἐὰν μὴ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἴδητε, οὐ μὴ πιστεύετε*, and Heb. xiii. 5 Sept. *οὐ μή σε ἐγκαταλείπω*; indeed, one Cod. (quoted by Griesb.) has in Rev. iii. 12 the Optative, *οὐ μὴ ἐξέλθοι*. The last is undoubtedly only a mistake of a transcriber, misled by the ear (the case is different in the orat. obliq. in Soph. Philoct. 611, Schaef. in loc.; cf. also the same on Demosth. II. 321), and the Subjunctive was long ago restored. Likewise in Heb. as above, *ἐγκαταλίπω* is undoubtedly the true reading. But in Jno. iv. 48 perhaps the reading ought to be *πιστεύητε*, as the Subj. *Present* is so used in Greek authors also, as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1024 *οὐδ᾽ οὐ μή ποτε χώρας φυγόντες τῆσδ᾽ ἐπεύχωνται θεοῖς* (according to Hm. and others), Xen. C. 8, 1, 5; An. 2, 2, 12 (see Hm. Eurip. Med. Elmsl. p. 390; Stallb. Plat. polit. p. 51; Ast, Plat. pol. p. 365), and, as in the passage from John, after a conditional clause with *ἐάν* in Xen. Hier. 11, 15 *ἐὰν τοὺς φίλους κρατῇς εὖ ποιῶν, οὐ μή σοι δύνωνται ἀντέχειν οἱ πολέμιοι*, and 520

frequently in Demosth. (Gayl. p. 437). In John, however, there is preponderant MS. authority [to which Sin. must be added] for πιστεύσητε, which Lchm. and Tdf. have adopted. What Hm. Iphig. Taur. p. 102 says of an Indic. Pres. after οὐ μή, the received text would hardly substantiate. As to Luke xviii. 7 see § 57, 3 and p. 494.

This intensive οὐ μή is used also in dependent clauses: not merely in relative clauses Matt. xvi. 28; Luke xviii. 30; Acts xiii. 41, but also in
451 objective clauses with ὅτι Luke xiii. 35; xxii. 16; Matt. xxiv. 34; Jno.
6th ed. xi. 56 τί δοκεῖ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν; *what think ye? that he will not come to the feast?* Likewise in direct question with τίς, Rev. xv. 4 τίς οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇ; Cf. with the former passages, Xen. C. 8, 1, 5 τοῦτο γὰρ εἶ εἰδέναι χρή, ὅτι οὐ μὴ δύνηται Κῦρος εὑρεῖν etc. Thuc. 5, 69; and with the latter, Neh. ii. 3 διὰ τί οὐ μὴ γένηται πονηρόν etc. On οὐ μή in an interrogative clause, without an interrogative pronoun, construed with a Subjunctive or a Future (Ruth iii. 1), see § 57, 3, p. 511 sq.

Note. *Not ..., no one ..., nothing ... except*, is commonly expressed by οὐ ..., οὐδείς ..., οὐδέν ... εἰ μή, as in Matt. xi. 27; xxi. 19; Luke iv. 26; Jno. xvii. 12, etc. (Klotz, Devar. p. 524). More rarely the negation is followed by πλήν, as in Acts xx. 23; xxvii. 22; ἤ is found only in Jno. xiii. 10 text. rec.: ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν ἢ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι. Most Codd. have εἰ μή, and this Lchm. has adopted. The latter, however, may be a correction of the rarer ἤ, which yet occasionally occurs, Xen. C. 7, 5, 41.

§ 57. INTERROGATIVE PARTICLES.

1. In the N. T., interrogative sentences (cf. Krü. 250 f.) which commence neither with an interrogative pronoun, nor with a special interrogative adverb (πῶς, ποῦ etc.),

474 a. if *direct*, have usually no interrogative particle (Jno. vii. 23;
5th ed. xiii. 6; xix. 10; Acts xxi. 37; Luke xiii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 2; Rom.
531 ii. 21; Gal. iii. 21, etc.).[1] Sometimes, however, contrary to the usage of the written language of the Greeks, εἰ is employed before a question in which the inquirer merely discloses his uncertainty, without intimating that he expects a reply (see no. 2).

b. if *indirect*, they are introduced by εἰ (which is here, too, the conditional conjunction).[2]

[1] Hence it is sometimes matter of dispute among commentators whether a particular sentence is to be taken as interrogative or not, e.g. Jno. xvi. 31; Rom. viii. 33; xiv. 22; 1 Cor. i. 13; 2 Cor. iii. 1; xii. 19; Heb. x. 2; Jas. ii. 4; or how many words are comprehended in an interrogation, e.g. Jno. vii. 19; Rom. iv. 1. On this, Grammar can ordinarily give no decision.

[2] How εἰ acquires the general force of an interrogative particle, see *Hartung*, Partik. II. 201 ff.; cf. *Klotz*, Devar. 508.

In direct double questions *πότερον . . . ἤ* is used only once, Jno. vii. 17; elsewhere the first question is without an interrogative particle, Luke xx. 4; Gal. i. 10; iii. 2; Rom. ii. 3, etc., and only the second has *ἤ*, — if negative, *ἢ οὔ* Matt. xxii. 17; Luke xx. 22, or *ἢ μή* Mark xii. 14; cf. Bos, Ellips. p. 759; Klotz, Devar. 576 sq. Sometimes, moreover, *ἤ* is used in an interrogative sentence which refers to a preceding categorical sentence (like the Latin *an*, see Hand, Tursell. I. 349) 2 Cor. xi. 7 *εἰ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει . . . ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἐμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν; or did I commit an offence?* Rom. vi. 3 (Dio C. 282, 20) etc. cf. Lehmann, Lucian. II. 331 sq.

2. The following are instances of the singular use of *εἰ* in *direct* questions (especially in Luke): Acts i. 6 *ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· κύριε, εἰ . . . ἀποκαθιστάνεις τὴν βασιλείαν;* Luke xxii. 49 *εἶπον· κύριε, εἰ πατάξομεν ἐν μαχαίρᾳ;* Matt. xii. 10; xix. 3; Luke xiii. 23; Acts xix. 2; xxi. 37; xxii. 25; Mark viii. 23 (on Matt. xx. 15 see Mey.); cf. Sept. Gen. xvii. 17; xliii. 6; 1 Sam. x. 24; 2 Sam. ii. 1; xx. 17; 1 Kings xiii. 14; xxii. 6; Jon. iv. 4, 9; Joel i. 2; Tob. v. 5; 2 Macc. vii. 7; Ruth i. 19. Perhaps this use originated in an ellipsis: *I should like to know* (Mey. on Matt. xii. 10); cf. the indirect inquiry in German, *ob das wahr ist?* But at the period of which we are treating *εἰ* had attained to all the rights of a direct interrogative (cf. Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 417), like the Lat. *an* which later writers also use in direct question; and it would be affectation to insist on taking *εἰ* as equivalent to the indirect *an* (Fr. Mt. p. 425; Mr. p. 327). The *si* by which this *εἰ* is rendered in the Vulgate has become in the same way a direct, from an indirect (Liv. 39, 50), interrogative particle. That even in Greek authors *εἰ* is sometimes used in *direct* questions (Hoogev. doctr. partic. I. 327) was asserted again by Stallb. Phileb. p. 117, but denied correctly in regard to Attic prose by Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 39 sq., and Stallb. recalled his statement, Plat. Alcib. I. 231; cf., further, Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 221; Fr. Mr. p. 328, and Klotz, Devar. 511. In the passage, Odyss. 1, 158, adduced by Zeune, Vig. p. 506, *εἰ* was long ago corrected into *ἤ*; in Plato rep. 5, 478 d. all good Codd. have *ἐντός* for *εἰ*, and in Aristoph. nub. 483 (Palairet, observatt. p. 60) *εἰ* does not mean *num*, but *an* in an indirect question. So also in Demosth. Callicl. p. 735 b. On the other hand, Dio Chr. 30, 299 *εἴ τι ἄλλο ὑμῖν προσέταξεν, ἐπέστειλεν ἢ διελέχθη;* where follows the answer: *πολλὰ καὶ δαιμόνια* — is probably corrupted (Reiske proposes *ἢ τι ἄλλο*),

452 6th ed.

532

475 7th ed.

or it is to be taken as an indirect question: *but if he gave you any other injunction?* (may be asked, some one will perhaps ask). Schneider, even in Plat. civ. 4, 440 e., retains on manuscript authority εἰ, which recent editors had changed into (ἀλλ') ἦ; but he explains this use of the particle in (only apparently) a direct question by an ellipsis, and has expunged the mark of interrogation. (Some have wanted to take ὅτι also as a direct interrogative in the N. T., but without sufficient reason, see § 53, 10, 5 p. 456 sq.).

The interrogative ἆρα is originally ἄρα strengthened, and in an interrogative sentence, distinguished as such by the voice, denotes the conclusion from something preceding, whether a negative answer is expected (where ἆρα is equivalent to *num igitur*), or an affirmative (*ergone*) Klotz, Devar. 180 sqq.[1] The former is the more usual in prose (Hm. Vig. 823), and occurs in the N. T. Luke xviii. 8 ἆρα εὑρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; *will he then find faith on the earth?* and ἀράγε Acts viii. 30, cf. Xen. Mem. 3, 8, 3 ἀράγε, ἔφη, ἐρωτᾷς με, εἴ τι οἶδα πυρετοῦ ἀγαθόν; οὐκ ἔγωγ', ἔφη. On the other hand, in Gal. ii. 17 ἆρα might be rendered by *ergone:* Christ is therefore a minister of sin? (cf. Schaef. Melet. p. 89; Stallb. Plat. rep. 453 II. 223; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 415). Others read ἄρα without a question; 6th ed. this is opposed, however, by the fact that Paul invariably makes a question precede μὴ γένοιτο, see Mey. in loc.

To the interrogative particles, πῶς, πότε, ποῦ, etc., which are appropriated 533 to direct questions, correspond, as is well known, in indirect questions (and discourse) the relative forms ὅπως, ὁπότε, ὅπου, etc. (Bttm. II. 277). Even Attic authors, however, do not always observe the distinction (see Kühner II. 583; Hm. Soph. Antig. p. 80; Poppo, ind. ad Xenoph. Cyrop. under πῶς and ποῦ), and later writers neglect it frequently. In the N. T. the interrogative forms are predominant even in indirect discourse (πόθεν Jno. vii. 27, ποῦ Matt. viii. 20; Jno. iii. 8; on πῶς see Wahl, Clav. 439). Ὅπου in the N. T. is employed rather as a strict relative.

3. In *negative* interrogative sentences,

a. οὐ where an affirmative answer is expected (Hartung, Partik. 476 II. 88) is commonly equivalent to *nonne*, as in Matt. vii. 22 οὐ 7th ed. τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι προεφητεύσαμεν; *have we not?* etc. xiii. 27; Luke xii. 6; xvii. 17; Jas. ii. 5; Heb. iii. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xiv. 23. Sometimes, when the speaker himself assumes a negative answer, οὐ is used with an expression of indignation and reproach, Acts xiii. 10 οὐ παύσῃ διαστρέφων τὰς ὁδοὺς κυρίου τὰς εὐθείας; *wilt thou not cease* etc.? The tone employed indicates, as with us, the par-

[1] A different view is taken by *Leidenroth*, de vera vocum origine ac vi per linguar. comparationem investiganda (Lips. 1830. 8vo.) p. 59 sqq. Further, see on ἄρα and ἆρα *Sheppard* in the Classical Museum, no. 18.

ticular cast of the question: WILT *thou not cease?* (i.e. thou wilt cease wilt thou not?) is *nonne desines?* but, *wilt thou not* CEASE? (i.e. wilt thou persist?) is *non desines?* The *οὐ* here negatives the verb (non desinere i. q. pergere), see Franke I. 15. Cf. Plut. Lucull. c. 40 *οὐ παύσῃ σὺ πλουτῶν μὲν ὡς Κράσσος, ζῶν δ' ὡς Λούκουλλος, λέγων δὲ ὡς Κάτων;* So also Luke xvii. 18; Mark xiv. 60. — *Οὐκ ἄρα* in Acts xxi. 38 means *non igitur, thou art not therefore* (as I supposed, but as I now see denied) etc. Klotz, Devar. 186, (*nonne*, as the Vulgate renders it, would rather be, in connection with *nevertheless*, *ἆρ' οὐ* or *οὔκουν*, see Hm. Vig. 795, 824).

b. *Μή* (*μήτι*) is used, when a negative answer is presumed or expected (Franke as above, 18).[1] Jno. vii. 31 *μὴ πλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσει;* surely he will not do more signs will he? (that is not conceivable), xxi. 5; Rom. iii. 5 (Philippi is incorrect), ix. 20; xi. 1; Matt. vii. 16; Mark iv. 21; Acts x. 47, etc. Both interrogatives are (in accordance with the above distinction) used consecutively in Luke vi. 39 *μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον πεσοῦνται;* The assertion of Hm. (Vig. 789), that *μή* sometimes anticipates an affirmative answer, has been contested by Franke l. c. and others; some interpreters, however, have wanted to take it so sometimes in the N. T. (Lücke, Joh. I. 602; cf. Fr. Mtth. p. 432). But the speaker always has his eye on a negative answer, and would not be surprised if he received such: Jno. iv. 33 has any one brought him anything to 534
eat? (I can't believe it, especially here in the country of the Samaritans!), viii. 22: will he kill himself? (yet we cannot believe that of him), cf. Matt. xii. 23; Jno. iv. 29; vii. 26, 35. Occa- 454
sionally there exists an inclination to believe what is asked; but 6th ed.
inasmuch as the question is put negatively, the speaker assumes the appearance, at least, of wishing a negative reply. Some have taken *μή* in the sense of *nonne* likewise in Jas. iii. 14 *εἰ ζῆλον πικρὸν ἔχετε . . . μὴ κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας* — but incorrectly. The sentence is categorical: *do not boast* (of your Christian knowledge, vs. 13) *against the truth.* When *μὴ οὐ* occurs in a question, *οὐ* belongs to the verb of the sentence, and *μή* alone is interrogatory, as in Rom. x. 18 *μὴ οὐκ ἤκουσαν; did they fail to hear?* (i.e. it can't be that they did not hear, can it?) vs. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 4, 5; xi. 22 (Judg. vi. 13; xiv. 3; Jer. viii. 4; Xen. Mem. 4, 2, 12; Plat. Meno p. 89 c. and Lysias 213 d.; Acta Apocr. p. 79). On the other hand, *οὐ μή* is merely a strengthened 477
7th ed.

[1] As to the Latin *num*, see *Hand*, Tursell. p. 320.

form of a simple negation which may stand either interrogatively or not: Jno. xviii. 11 *οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό; shall I not drink it?* Arrian. Epictet. 3, 22, 33, see § 56, 3, 505 sq.

Acts vii. 42 *μὴ σφάγια καὶ θυσίας προσηνέγκατέ μοι ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ;* (from Amos): *did ye offer to me ... in the wilderness?* (ye did not, did ye?); the narrative then proceeds with *καὶ ἀνελάβετε*, because the question implies: *ye brought me no offerings for forty years and ye* (even) *took up* etc. A different view is given by Fr. Mr. p. 66. On the other hand, see Mey. The passage in Amos has not yet been itself duly explained. Perhaps the prophet follows a different tradition from that contained in the Pentateuch. As to Luke xviii. 7 see above, p. 494.

In Matt. vii. 9 *τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;* two questions are blended: *who is there among you that ... would give?* and, *would one if asked for ... give ...* (surely he would not give, would he)? Cf. Luke xi. 11 and Bornem. in loc.

Note. As to Jno. xviii. 37 see, in particular, Hm. Vig. 794. *Οὔκουν* is *non* (*nonne*) *ergo* with or without a question, *οὐκοῦν ergo* (the negation being dropped). Now if we read the above passage interrogatively *οὔκουν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ;* it will mean, *art thou then not a king? nonne ergo* (Hm. Vig. 795) *rex es?* and the speaker thinks of an affirmative answer (after the words of Jesus *ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμή* etc.), see no. 3. But *οὐκοῦν* (as editors have it) *βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ* is simpler: *thou art a king then, ergo*
535 *rex es* (perhaps with a touch of irony, see Bremi, Demosth. p. 238) with or without a question (Xen. Cyr. 2, 4, 15; 5, 2, 26. 29; Aristot. rhet. 3, 18, 14, etc.). *Οὐκοῦν* gets the meaning of *therefore, then, accordingly* because originally *οὐκοῦν* also was regarded as interrogative, *thou art a king then?* (is it not so? is that not true?), see Hm. Vig. p. 794 sq.; cf. Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 432 sq.[1] A question appears to me more suitable to the speaker as a magistrate, and Lücke has expressed the same opinion. At all events, *οὐκοῦν* cannot signify *non igitur*, as Kühnöl and Bretschneider maintain; in that case it would require to be written separately *οὐκ οὖν*.

---

455 6th ed. **B.** STRUCTURE OF PROPOSITIONS AND THEIR COMBINATION INTO PERIODS.

478 7th ed. § 58. THE PROPOSITION AND ITS COMPONENT PARTS, IN GENERAL.

1. The necessary parts of a simple sentence are Subject, Predicate, and Copula. As, however, the Subject and the Predicate may be supplemented and enlarged in a variety of ways by means

[1] *Rost* 742 and *Gayl.* p. 149 are opposed to distinguishing the words by means of accentuation.

of adjuncts; so again the Predicate is frequently, and the Subject sometimes, blended with the Copula. The limits of the Copula are never doubtful; but it may sometimes be uncertain which and how many words constitute the Subject or the Predicate, as in Rom. i. 17; 2 Cor. i. 17; xi. 13; xiii. 7. In this event we encounter not a grammatical but a hermeneutical inquiry.

The Infinitive (by itself), when it stands for the Imperative (Phil. iii. 16), see § 43, 5 p. 316, is not a complete sentence, because every grammatical indication of the subject is wanting, which in other moods is given by the person of the verb.

2. The Subject and the Predicate are regularly nouns (including Infinitives used as substantives, Phil. i. 22, 29; 1 Thess. iv. 3); but sometimes whole clauses take their place: Luke xxii. 37 *τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη*, 1 Thess. iv. 1 *παρελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν τὸ πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς περιπατεῖν*, Matt. xv. 26 *οὐκ ἔστιν καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων* etc. The 536
case of the Subject (in independent sentences) is, as everybody knows, the Nominative, (in dependent the Accusative, Acc. with Inf.); yet the Partitive Genitive also may elliptically stand as the Subject, Acts xxi. 16 see § 30, 8, note 2. On the other hand, the alleged use of *ἐν* as nota nominativi, in imitation of the Hebrew בְּ essentiae, does not merit a moment's consideration, and the latter itself is a grammatical figment; see § 29, note, p. 184.

Deserving of distinct mention is the Predicate which consists of a Participle with the Article, as in Matt. x. 20 *οὐ γὰρ ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ οἱ λαλοῦντες*, Jno. v. 32; xiv. 28; Phil. ii. 13; Rom. viii. 33; Gal. i. 7, etc.; this is to be carefully distinguished from the participle without the article, cf. Mtth. 717; Fr. Rom. II. 212 sq.

3. The Copula, as is well known, regularly agrees with the Subject in number, the Predicate in number and gender; except that when the Predicate consists of a substantive it may differ in gender and number from the Subject, e.g. 2 Cor. i. 14 *καύχημα ὑμῶν ἐσμέν*, 1 Thess. ii. 20 *ὑμεῖς ἐστε ἡ δόξα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ χαρά*, Jno. 479
xi. 25 *ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή*, viii. 12; 2 Cor. iii. 2; Rom. 7th ed.
vii. 13; Eph. i. 23 *ἥτις (ἡ ἐκκλησία) ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ* (see § 24, 3); 1 Cor. xi. 7; Col. iv. 11; Luke xxii. 20.[1] Yet deviations 456
from the preceding rule occur, even in prose, when the writer pays 6th ed.
more regard to the *meaning* of the subject than to its grammatical

[1] Instances in which the Neuter has a depreciatory force, as in 1 Cor. vi. 11 *ταῦτά τινες ἦτε*, grammatically considered, come likewise under this head.

form. This takes place more frequently in Greek than in Latin. Consequently

a. A Singular Predicate (Copula) is joined to a Neuter Plural, mostly when the Subject is *lifeless*, and may be regarded as a mass (Bhdy. 418; Mtth. 761); as, Jno. x. 25 τὰ ἔργα . . . μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ, 2 Pet. ii. 20 γέγονεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἔσχατα χείρονα τῶν πρώτων, Acts i. 18; xxvi. 24; Jno. ix. 3; x. 21; iii. 23; xix. 31; Rev. viii. 3. But

α) when prominence is to be given to the plurality and diversity of the objects (Weber, Demosth. p. 529), the Pred. is put in the Plural, as Jno. xix. 31 ἵνα κατεαγῶσιν αὐτῶν (of the three persons crucified) τὰ σκέλη (previously ἵνα μὴ μείνῃ τὰ σώματα is used, cf. also vi. 13; Rev. xxi. 12; xx. 7; Xen. An. 1, 7, 17); seldom otherwise, 1 Tim. v. 25 τὰ ἄλλως ἔχοντα (ἔργα) κρυβῆναι οὐ δύνανται, Rev. i. 19 ἃ εἶδες καὶ ἃ εἰσίν (but immediately afterwards ἃ μέλλει γίνεσθαι), Luke xxiv. 11 (not Rom. iii. 2, see § 39, 1 a.). In 2 Pet. iii. 10 Sing. and Plur. are united. Likewise
537 in Greek authors (Rost 475; Kühner II. 50) the Plural of the verb is not unfrequently used, especially when instead of the Neut. another substantive, Masculine or Feminine, may be in the mind (Hm. Soph. Elect. p. 67; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 97 f. and Cyrop. p. 116; yet see Schneider, Plat. civ. I. 93); yet in other cases also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 2; Anab. 1, 4, 4; Hipparch. 8, 10; Thuc. 6, 62; Ael. anim. 11, 37; Plat. rep. 1, 353 c.

β) neuters, however, which denote or refer to *animate* objects, especially persons, are almost always construed with a Plural Pred.; as, Matt. x. 21 ἐπαναστήσονται τέκνα ἐπὶ γονεῖς καὶ θανατώσουσιν αὐτούς, Jas. ii. 19 τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν, Jno. x. 8 οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα, Mark iii. 11; v. 13; vii. 28; Matt. vi. 26; xii. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 17; Rev. iii. 2, 4; xi. 13, 18; xvi. 14; xix. 21 (Matt. xxvii. 52 πολλὰ σώματα τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων ἠγέρθησαν, Rev. xi. 13). In other passages the Codd. vary remarkably, and there is a preponderance of authority for the Sing. in Mark iv. 4; Luke iv. 41; viii. 38; xiii. 19; Jno. x. 12; 1 Jno. iv. 1; Rev. xviii. 3; indeed, in Luke viii. 2 is found without var. ἀφ' ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει, vs. 30 εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλά, and in 1 Jno. iii. 10 φανερά ἐστιν τὰ τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τ. τοῦ διαβόλου. Cf. also Eph. iv. 17 and Rom. ix. 8. The Sing. and Plur. are connected in Jno. x. 4 τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι
480 οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ, 27 τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούει
Tdf. καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσί μοι, Rev. xvi. 14; cf. 1 Sam. ix. 12. Lastly

in Rev. xvii. 12 *τὰ δέκα κέρατα δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσίν* the Plur. of the verb is more appropriate, on account of the Predicate noun, cf. 1 Cor. x. 11. The use of the Plural Pred. with animate Subjects is the rule in Greek authors also, cf. Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 9 *τὰ ζῶα ἐπίστανται*, Plat. Lach. 180 e. *τὰ μειράκια ἐπιμέμνηνται*, Thuc. 1, 58; 4, 88; 7, 57; Eur. Bacch. 677 f.; Arrian. Alex. 3, 28, 11; 5, 17, 12; see Hm. Vig. 739.

In general, the construction of Neuters with Plural verbs is more frequent in Greek prose authors than is usually supposed (though the 457
Codd. vary noticeably), Reitz, Lucian. VII. 483 Bip.; Ast, Plat. legg. 6th ed.
p. 46; Zell, Aristot. Ethic. Nicom. p. 4 and 209; Bremi, exc. 10 ad Lys. p. 448 sq.; Held, Plutarch. Aem. Paull. p. 280; Ellendt, praef. ad Arrian. I. 21 sq.; Bornem. Xen. Cyrop. p. 173, but chiefly in later writers, and that without any distinction (Agath. 4, 5; 9, 15; 26, 9; 28, 1; 32, 6; 39, 10; 42, 6, etc.; Thilo, Apocr. I. 182; Boisson. Psell. p. 257 sq.; Dresser, ind. to Epiphan. monach. p. 136). The proposal of Jacobs (Athen. p. 228, cf. also Heind. Cratyl. p. 137) to substitute the Singular in all such passages was apparently retracted subsequently by that scholar himself (cf. Jacobs, Philostr. imag. p. 236), though where Codd. offer the Singular 538
we may, with Boisson. Eunap. p. 420, 601, give it the preference.

What was said of the Singular of the Pred. after Neuters applies only to the form of the verb; if the Predicate consists of *εἶναι* or *γίνεσθαι* with an adjective, the latter is put in the Plur. while the verb is Sing., as in Gal. v. 19 *φανερά ἐστιν τὰ ἔργα τῆς σαρκός*, 1 Cor. xiv. 25 *τὰ κρυπτὰ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ φανερὰ γίνεται*.

4. b. *Collectives* denoting *animate* objects are construed with a Plural Pred.: Matt. xxi. 8 *ὁ πλεῖστος ὄχλος ἔστρωσαν ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια* (Mark ix. 15; Luke vi. 19; xxiii. 1), 1 Cor. xvi. 15 *οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ, ὅτι . . . εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτούς*, Rev. xviii. 4 *ἐξέλθετε ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὁ λαός μου* (Hesiod. scut. 327), also ix. 18 *ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, viii. 9 (but Sing. viii. 8 f., 11); Luke viii. 37; Acts xxv. 24. Elsewhere the Plur. and the Sing. of the verb or Pred. occur in connection, as in Jno. vi. 2 *ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς, ὅτι ἑώρων* (xii. 9 f., 12 f., 18), Luke i. 21 *ἦν ὁ λαὸς προσδοκῶν καὶ ἐθαύμαζον*, Acts xv. 12 (1 Cor. xvi. 15). The Plural, in reference to a Collective, occurs in Luke ix. 12 *ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα ἀπελθόντες . . . καταλύσωσι* etc. When the Pred. consists of an adjective with *εἶναι*, the adjective is of course not only Plur. but also in the gender of the persons, as in Jno. vii. 49 *ὁ ὄχλος οὗτος . . . ἐπάρατοί εἰσιν*. On the other hand, attributives in such constructions may stand either in the Plur. or the Sing.; — in the Sing. when they precede

the Substantive, as Mark ix. 15 πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἰδόντες ... ἐξεθαμβήθησαν (Luke xix. 37 ; Acts v. 16 ; xxi. 36 ; xxv. 24), Luke xxiii. 1 ἀναστὰν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος ἤγαγον αὐτόν. Yet in the N. T. the regular construction of Collectives with a Sing. Pred. is the more usual. The Plural construction often occurs in the Sept. also, as in Judg. ii. 10 ; Ruth iv. 11 ; 1 Sam. xii. 18 f. ; 1 Kings iii. 2 ; viii. 66 ; xii. 12 ; Isa. li. 4 ; Judith vi. 18 (λαός is almost invariably construed with a Plural verb), and it is by no means rare in Greek authors ; as, Her. 9, 23 ὥς σφι τὸ πλῆθος ἐπεβοήθησαν, Philostr. her. p. 709 ὁ στρατὸς ἄθυμοι ἦσαν, Thuc. 1, 20 ; 4, 128 ; Xen. Mem. 4, 3, 10 ; Aelian. anim. 5, 54 ; Plutarch. Mar. p. 418 c. ; Pausan. 7, 9, 3 ; see Reitz, Lucian. VI. 533 Lehm ; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 446 ; Krüger, Dion. H. p. 234 ; Poppo, Thuc. III. 1. 529 sq. ; Ellendt, Arrian. Alex. I. 105.

481 7th ed.

458 6th ed. 539

Here belongs in the main also 1 Tim. ii. 15 σωθήσεται δὲ (ἡ γυνὴ) διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν μείνωσιν (αἱ γυναῖκες) ἐν πίστει, for ἡ γυνή which is to be supplied is to be understood of the whole sex. But in Jno. xvi. 32 ἵνα σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια, the Plural verb is not the immediate predicate of ἕκαστος, but ἕκαστος is annexed to the Plural as explanatory, as in Acts ii. 6 ἤκουον εἷς ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ, Rev. xx. 13 (v. 8) 1 Pet. iv. 10 ; Acts xi. 29 ; see Hes. scut. 283 ; Aelian. anim. 15, 5 ; Var. Hist. 14, 46 ; Wesseling, Diod. Sic. II. 105 ; Brunck, Aristoph. Plut. 784 ; Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 622. Similar to this is Acts ii. 12 and 1 Cor. iv. 6 ἵνα μὴ εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου. On the other hand, in Acts ii. 3 a suggestion of the Singular subject for ἐκάθισε (for ἐκάθισαν is obviously a correction, to conform to ὤφθησαν) is contained in ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. Other instances of a transition from the Plur. of a verb to the Sing. have been collected by Heind. Plat. Protag. p. 499 ; Jacobs, Aelian. anim. II. 100.

Collectives have influenced only the gender of the Pred. in Luke x. 13 εἰ ἐν Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἐγενήθησαν αἱ δυνάμεις ... πάλαι ἂν ἐν σάκκῳ καθήμενοι (the inhabitants) μετενόησαν.

Note 1. Some have thought that a *preceding* Sing. verb construed with a (Masc. or Fem.) Plural Subject (the schema Pindaricum, Mtth. 766 ; Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 86) occurs in Luke ix. 28 ἐγένετο ... ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ. But ἐγένετο is to be taken by itself, and ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ as a detached expression of time inserted parenthetically, see § 62, 2. On the other hand, in Luke ix. 13 εἰσίν is not construed with πλέον, but the latter is an unconnected insertion (cf. Xen. Anab. 1, 2, 11), and εἰσίν belongs to ἄρτοι. That the Imperat. ἄγε, which is nearly a pure interjection, is connected with a Plural subject without disturbing the construction, in Jas. iv. 13 ἄγε νῦν οἱ λέγοντες and v. 1 ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, is obvious. This usage is frequent in Greek prose authors, e.g. Xen. Cyr. 4, 2, 47 ; 5, 3, 4 ;

Apol. 14; cf. Alberti, observ. on Jas. iv. 13; Palairet, observ. p. 502 sq.; Wetsten. N. T. II. 676; Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 52 (similar to which is the Latin *age*, Hand, Tursell. I. 205). Likewise φέρε is so used Himer. orat. 17, 6.

Note 2. Here may be introduced also a remark, in passing, on the usage according to which a Plural verb and pronoun are employed by an individual speaker in reference to himself (Glass. I. 320 sqq.). The communicative force is still manifest in Mark iv. 30 πῶς ὁμοιώσωμεν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ἐν τίνι αὐτὴν παραβολῇ θῶμεν; Jno. iii. 11. It occurs much more frequently in the Epistles (as among the Romans scripsimus, misimus), where the author speaks in his apostolic character, as in Rom. i. 5; cf. vs. 6 (otherwise explained by van Hengel, Rom. p. 52), Col. iv. 3 cf. the immediately following δέδεμαι, Heb. xiii. 18 cf. vs. 19; Gal. i. 8. Only it is necessary to distinguish from this usage the case in which the writer really includes other persons, though it may be difficult in particular instances to specify when and what persons he means besides himself, and at any rate that cannot be determined on grammatical grounds. In Eph. i. 3 ff. and 1 Cor. iv. 9 the Plural proper is undoubtedly used. As to Jno. xxi. 24 see Mey. (In 1 Cor. xv. 31 according to the reading καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω, νὴ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, ἣν ἔχω, the Sing. and the Plur. would be used together; but ὑμετέραν [which also Cod. Sin. gives] is here unquestionably to be preferred.)

482 f. b. m. 540 459 6th ed.

5. Such sentences as the following are *not* to be regarded as instances of grammatical discord between the Subj. and Pred.: Matt. vi. 34 ἀρκετὸν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἡ κακία αὐτῆς, 2 Cor. ii. 6 ἱκανὸν τῷ τοιούτῳ ἡ ἐπιτιμία αὕτη. The Neuters here are used as substantives: *a sufficiency for such a one is*, like triste lupus stabulis (Virg. ecl. 3, 80) *a sad thing* for the folds, (Ast, Plat. polit. p. 413; Hm. Vig. p. 699). Instances in Greek authors are: Her. 3, 36 σοφὸν ἡ προμηθίη, Xen. Hi. 6, 9 ὁ πόλεμος φοβερόν, Diog. L. 1, 98 καλὸν ἡσυχία, Xen. M. 2, 3, 1; Plat. legg. 4, 707 a.; Plut. paedag. 4, 3; Lucian. philops. 7; Isocr. Demon. p. 8; Plat. conviv. p. 176 d.; Aristot. rhet. 2, 2, 46 and eth. Nic. 8, 1, 3; Lucian. fug. 13; Plut. mul. virt. p. 225 Tauchn.; Aelian. anim. 2, 10; Dio Chr. 40. 494; Sext. Emp. math. 11, 96. Cf. Georgi, Hierocr. I. 51; Wetsten. I. 337; Kypke, obs. I. 40; Fischer, Well. III. a. p. 310 sq.; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 237, ed. Lips.; Held, Plut. Timol. p. 367 sq.; Kühner, Gr. II. 45; Waitz, Aristot. categ. p. 292. In Lat. cf. Ovid. amor. 1, 9, 4; Cic. off. 1, 4; famil. 6, 21; Virg. eclog. 3, 82; Aen. 4, 569; Stat. Theb. 2, 399; Vechner, Hellenol. p. 247 sqq. (As to the rhetorical emphasis sometimes involved in this use of the Neuter, see Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 396.)

Of a different sort, but also deserving of notice, is the construction in 1 Pet. ii. 19 *τοῦτο γὰρ χάρις*; cf. *τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀνάμνησις* Demosth. and upon it Schaefer appar. V. 289; Herm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 305.

6. If the Subject, or the Predicate, or both, be compound (Mtth. 760), the grammatical form of the Predicate is determined according to the following rules:

a. If the Subject is composed of the 1st Person and 3d, the verb is put in the 1st Pers. Plur., as Jno. x. 30 *ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἕν ἐσμεν*, 1 Cor. ix. 6 *ἢ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρνάβας οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν* etc.
483 (1 Cor. xv. 11); Matt. ix. 14; Luke ii. 48 (Eurip. Med. 1020);
7th ed. but in Gal. i. 8 we find *ἐὰν ἡμεῖς ἢ ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανοῦ εὐαγγελίζηται*, the latter Subject being regarded as the more exalted, Isae. 11, 10. When, on the other hand, to the 2d Pers. is annexed a 3d, the
541 former receives the preference as the more important, and the verb (which precedes) is put in the 2d Pers., as in Acts xvi. 31 *σωθήσῃ σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου* xi. 14.

b. When the several Subjects Sing. are of the 3d Person, or are impersonal objects,

α) the Pred., if it *follows*, is regularly put in the Plural, as in Acts iii. 1 *Πέτρος καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον*, iv. 19; xii. 25; xiii. 46; xiv. 14; xv. 35; xvi. 25; xxv. 13; 1 Cor. xv. 50; Jas. ii. 15; and its Gender is Masculine when there is a Masc. among the Subjects, 2 Pet. iii. 7. An adjective belonging to them all agrees sometimes only with the first or the principal Subject, as in Acts v. 29 *ἀποκριθεὶς Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι εἶπαν*; in the opposite case, Acts iv. 19, the Adj. is in the Masculine when the nouns are
460 of different sex, as Acts xxv. 13 *Ἀγρίππας καὶ Βερνίκη κατήντησαν*
6th ed. *... ἀσπασάμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*, Jas. ii. 15. When the disjunctive *ἤ* is used, a Singular Pred. also follows several Subjects, as in Matt. v. 18; xii. 25; xviii. 8; Eph. v. 5.

β) if the Pred. *precedes*, it is put either in the Plural, in case the author had in mind a plurality of Subjects, Mark x. 35 *προσπορεύονται αὐτῷ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης*, Jno. xxi. 2, hence with *καί ... καί* or *τε ... καί* Luke xxiii. 12 *ἐγένοντο φίλοι ὅ τε Πιλᾶτος καὶ ὁ Ἡρῴδης* (Acts i. 13; iv. 27; v. 24; xviii. 5), Tit. i. 15 *μεμίανται αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νοῦς καὶ ἡ συνείδησις*; or in the Singular, if the Subjects are to be conceived separately, 1 Tim. vi. 4 *ἐξ ὧν γίνεται φθόνος, ἔρις, βλασφημίαι* etc. Rev. ix. 17 (Thuc. 1, 47; Plat. Gorg. 503 e.; 517 d.; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 1; Quint. inst. 9, 4, 22); 1 Cor. xiv. 24 *ἐὰν εἰσέλθῃ τις ἄπιστος ἢ ἰδιώτης* (so commonly when there is a disjunction by *ἤ* 1 Cor. vii. 15; 1 Pet.

iv. 15) [?]; Acts v. 38; .xx. 4; 1 Cor. vii. 34; or only the first Subject, usually as the principal one, is specially taken into consideration, Jno. ii. 2 ἐκλήθη (καὶ) ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, iv. 53; viii. 52; xviii. 15; xx. 3; Acts xxvi. 30; Luke xxii. 14; Matt. xii. 3; Philem. 23; Rev. i. 3; xii. 7, etc.; Plat. Theag. 124 e.; Paus. 9, 13, 3; 9, 36, 1; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 25; Mdv. S. 3 f. In such case a predicate participle or adjective is put in the Plural, as in Luke ii. 33 ἦν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες, Rev. viii. 7. Cf., in general, Herm. Vig. p. 194; d'Orville, Charit. 497; Schoem. Isae. 462. When the Subjects are connected by ἤ Greek authors usually employ the Plural of the verb, cf. Porson, Eurip. Hecub. p. 12, Lips.; Schaef. Melet. p. 24; Schoem. Isac. p. 295 (exactly as after ἄλλος ἄλλῳ and the like, see Jacobs, Philostr. p. 377). The distinction which Matth. Eurip. Hec. 84; Sprachl. II. 768 set up, is not perceptible, at least in the N. T. (The Sing. 542
is used quite regularly in the following arrangement, εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος . . . Acts xxiii. 9.)

By means of this construction very decided prominence is imparted to 484
one subject out of several in Jno. ii. 12 κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ 7th ed.
μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, iv. 12, 53; Luke vi. 3; viii. 22; Acts vii. 15, and the propriety of using the Singular Pred. here is obvious. This mode of expression is of frequent occurrence in Hebrew (Gesen. Lehrg. 722), and (even in the form αὐτός τε καί or καὶ αὐτὸς καί Ruth i. 3, 6) is not rare in Greek authors, Matth. Eurip. Iphig. A. 875; Weber, Demosth. 261; Fr. Mr. p. 70, 420; cf. Demosth. Euerg. 688 a. εἰ διομεῖ ἐπὶ Παλλαδίῳ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὰ παιδία etc. Alciphr. 1, 24 ὡς ἂν ἔχοιμι σώζεσθαι αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὰ παιδία.

7. When several Subjects or Predicates are united in a single proposition, the copulative particle is, according to the most simple construction, put before the last; whereas the disjunctive ἤ must stand before each of the successive words, as in Matt. vi. 31 τί φάγωμεν ἢ τί πίωμεν ἢ τί περιβαλώμεθα; Luke xviii. 29 ὃς ἀφῆκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα. Even the copulative is sometimes used in this manner, as in Rom. ii. 7 τοῖς δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν ζητοῦσι, xi. 33; xii. 2 (Lucian. Nigr. 17), see Fr. Rom. II. 553. When such a series of words is introduced by ὡς, this particle is used but once, at the beginning; in 1 Pet. iv. 15, on the other hand, the repetition of ὡς before ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος separates this predicate from those that precede, and gives it independent prominence. The connecting particle is thus not unfre- 461
quently repeated before each word of a whole series (*polysyndeton*), 6th ed.

a usage which is partly to be considered as merely an imitation of the Hebrew mode of expression (Ewald, krit. Gr. 650) Matt. xxiii. 23; Rev. xvii. 15; xviii. 12; xxi. 8, and partly seems to arise from an effort to secure due attention to the import of each word, as in Rom. vii. 12 *ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή*, ix. 4 *ὧν ἡ υἱοθεσία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ αἱ διαθῆκαι καὶ ἡ νομοθεσία καὶ ἡ λατρεία καὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι*, Luke xiv. 21 *τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ἀναπήρους καὶ τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς εἰσάγαγε*, 1 Pet. i. 4; iii. 8; Jno. xvi. 8; Acts xv. 20, 29; xxi. 25; Phil. iv. 12; Rev. ii. 19; v. 12; vii. 9, 12; viii. 5; Philostr. Apoll. 6, 24; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 32. So in particular with proper names, Acts i. 13; xiii. 1; xx. 4; Matt. iv. 25; Jno. xxi. 2. On the other hand, the connective of the different parts of a single sentence is entirely omitted (*asyndeton*),

a. In enumerations, 2 Tim. iii. 2 *ἔσονται οἱ ἄνθρωποι φίλαυτοι, φιλάργυροι, ἀλάζονες, ὑπερήφανοι, βλάσφημοι* etc., 1 Cor. iii. 12 *ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, λίθους τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην*, 1 Pet. iv. 3; Heb. xi. 37; 1 Tim. i. 10; iv. 13, 15 (Cic. fam. 2, 5; Attic. 13, 13); Rom. i. 29 ff.; ii. 19; Phil. iii. 5; Jno. v. 3; 1 Cor. xiii. 4–8; xiv. 26; 2 Cor. iv. 8 f.; Jas. v. 6;
543 1 Pet. ii. 9; Matt. xv. 19 (Col. iii. 11 is peculiar). Similar are Demosth. Phil. 4 p. 54 a. and Pantaen. p. 626 a.; Plat. Gorg. p. 503 e.; 517 d.; rep. 10 p. 598 c.; Lycurg. 36, 2; Lucian. dial. mort. 26, 2; Heliod. 1, 5.

b. In parallelisms and antitheses, which thus receive additional prominence, 2 Tim. iv. 2 *ἐπίστηθι εὐκαίρως ἀκαίρως* (like nolens
485 volens, honesta turpia, digni indigni, *ἄνω κάτω*, Aristoph. ran. 157
7th ed. *ἀνδρῶν γυναικῶν*, Beier, Cic. off. I. 135; Kritz. Sall. I. 55; II. 323), 1 Cor. iii. 2 *γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα*, vii 12; Jno. x. 16; Jas. i. 19. Yet asyndeton in such cases is not necessary, Col. ii. 8; 1 Cor. x. 20; cf. Fr. Mr. p. 31 sq. who, however, has drawn a distinction between the two modes of expression which seems to me too subtile.

When some of the Subjects are in the Plural, the verb following is put in the Plural, Acts v. 17, 29. This, however, seems not to be indispensable, Diod. S. 20, 72 *δάκρυα καὶ δεήσεις καὶ θρῆνος ἐγένετο συμφορητός*, Xen. rep. Ath. 1, 2.

Note. When several substantives either in the Subject or the Predicate are connected by *καί*, the first sometimes denotes an individual comprehended in the second as its genus, as *Ζεὺς καὶ θεοί*. After the second, therefore, *λοιποί* was supplied; but the intention of the expression is to give prominence to the individual as the principal subject, as in Acts v. 29

ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι (Theodoret. III. 223; see Schaef. Sophocl. II. 314, 335), i. 14; Mark xvi. 7; Matt. xvi. 14 (yet see Mey. in loc.) cf. Mark x. 41.

This schema κατ' ἐξοχήν (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 221) is an established idiom in Greek authors, cf. Plat. Protag. p. 310 d. ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ θεοί (Plaut. capt. 5, 1, 1; Jovi diisque ago gratias), Iliad. 19, 63 Ἕκτορι καὶ Τρωσί, Aeschin. Timarch. p. 171 c. Σόλων ἐκεῖνος, ὁ παλαιὸς νομοθέτης, καὶ ὁ Δράκων καὶ οἱ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐκείνους νομοθέται, Aristoph. nub. 412 (Chrysippus et Stoici Cic. Tusc. 4, 5, 9), see Ast, Theophr. char. p. 120; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 25. On Eurip. Med. 1141, which Elmsley adduced in support of this idiom, see Hm. Med. p. 392 ed. Lips., besides Locella Xen. Ephes. p. 208. (Of a different yet kindred nature is the Latin phrase exercitus equitatusque, Caes. b. gall. 2, 11.) 462 6th ed.

8. If two predicative verbs have a common *object*, and both verbs govern the same case, the object is expressed only once, as in Luke xiv. 4 ἰάσατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν, Matt. iv. 11. In Greek authors, too, the object is regularly but once expressed even when the verbs govern different cases, Krü. 227. In the N. T., when the verbs govern different cases, the object is usually repeated in the form of a pronoun, as in Luke xvi. 2 φωνήσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτῷ, yet cf. Acts xiii. 3 ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν, Eph. v. 11 μὴ συγκοινωνεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐλέγχετε, 2 Thess. iii. 15; 1 Tim. vi. 2, see § 22, 1 p. 143. 544

9. Of the three constituent parts of a proposition, the subject and the predicate are indispensable; but the simple copula is implied in the mere juxtaposition of the subject and predicate: ὁ θεὸς σοφός (which in Greek can only mean, *God is wise*). The same holds also when the subject and the predicate are extended, as in Heb. v. 13 πᾶς ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ἄπειρος λόγου δικαιοσύνης, 2 Cor. i. 21; Rom. xi. 15; see § 64, 2. But as the predicate is usually blended with the copula, so the subject may be implied in the copula, or in the blended copula and predicate. This takes place, independently of any special context, 486 7th ed.

a. When the verb is in the 1st or 2d Pers. (where the subjects are conceived as present, Mdv. p. 6) usually, as in Jno. xix. 22 ὃ γέγραφα, γέγραφα, Rom. viii. 15 οὐκ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας, as here even the pronouns ἐγώ, σύ are expressed only when emphasis is intended, see § 22, 6. If now the name of the subject be annexed to the pronoun of the 1st or 2d Pers., as in Gal. v. 2 ἐγὼ Παῦλος λέγω ὑμῖν (Eph. iii. 1; Rom. xvi. 22; 2 Cor. x. 1; Philem. 19; Rev. i. 9; xxii. 8, etc.), Gal. ii. 15 ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι . . .

εἰς Χριστ. Ἰησ. ἐπιστεύσαμεν (2 Cor. iv. 11) Luke xi. 39, the adjunct is in apposition.

b. When the verb is in the 3d Pers. (impersonally), and then

α) a Plur. Active is used, if merely (acting) subjects generally are meant (Mdv. S. 7); Matt. vii. 16 μήτι συλλέγουσιν ἀπὸ ἀκανθῶν σταφυλήν; do *they* (people) gather etc., does one gather etc. Jno. xv. 6; xx. 2; Mark x. 13; Acts iii. 2; Luke xvii. 23; Rev. xii. 6. See Fischer, Weller. III. I. 347; Duker, Thucyd. 7, 69; Bornem. Schol. p. 84.

β) a Sing. Active, when no definite subject is meant (Mdv. S. 7) of which the verb is predicated, but only the action or condition is designated as a fact: ὕει, βροντᾷ (Jno. xii. 29 βροντὴ γίνεται) *it rains*, etc. (cf. Germ. *es läutet*), 1 Cor. xv. 52 σαλπίσει *there will be a sound of trumpets*, also 2 Cor. x. 10 αἱ ἐπιστολαί, φησί, βαρεῖαι, *it is said* (Wisd. xv. 12). Yet, according to the concrete conception of the Greeks, this idiom may, strictly, be elliptical: ὕει, βροντᾷ Ζεύς (Xen. H. 4, 7, 4), σαλπίσει ὁ σαλπιγκτής, like the ἀναγνώσεται of the orators, see § 64, 3. On (the parenthetical) φησί, not infrequent in Greek authors, see Wolf, Demosth. Lept. p. 288; Wyttenbach, Plut. mor. II. 105; Boisson.
463 Eunap. p. 418, (in Latin *inquit*, *ait* is similar, see Heindorf, Horat.
6th ed. sat. p. 146; Ramshorn, Gramm. S. 383).

545 γ) More frequently, however, in such impersonal sense a Sing. Passive is used (Mdv. S. 8), as in 1 Cor. xv. 42 σπείρεται ἐν φθορᾷ, ἐγείρεται ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ (see v. Hengel in loc.), 1 Pet. iv. 6 εἰς τοῦτο καὶ νεκροῖς εὐηγγελίσθη etc., Matt. vii. 2, 7; v. 21, etc. This form is connected with the 3d Pers. Plur. Active in a parallelism in Luke xii. 48 ᾧ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ ζητηθήσεται παρ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ᾧ παρέθεντο πολύ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν.[1]

The forms of quotation, λέγει 2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16; Eph. iv. 8 etc., φησί 1 Cor. vi. 16; Heb. viii. 5, εἴρηκε Heb. iv. 4 (cf. the rabbinic אימר, see Surenhus. βιβλ. καταλλ. p. 11), μαρτυρεῖ Heb. vii. 17 (εἶπε 1 Cor. xv. 27), were probably never intended by the N. T. writers to be taken imper-
487 sonally; but for the most part the Subject (ὁ θεός) is directly or indirectly
7th ed. contained in the context. In 1 Cor. vi. 16 and Matt. xix. 5, however, in connection with φησί and εἶπεν there is an apostolic ellipsis (of ὁ θεός). Lastly, in Heb. vii. the best authorities [Sin. also] give μαρτυρεῖται.

There is nothing at all impersonal in Jno. xii. 40 (one acquainted with

[1] It cannot, however, be inferred from this that the 3d Plural Active strictly has a Passive sense (as in Chald., see my Gram. § 49), for even in Luke xii. 20 ἀπαιτοῦσιν may be taken concretely; see *Bornem.* in loc.

the Scriptures easily supplies ὁ θεός), 1 Cor. xv. 25 (θῇ scilicet Χριστός from αὐτόν), Rom. iv. 3, 22 ἐπίστευσεν Ἀβρ. τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην sc. τὸ πιστεῦσαι from ἐπίστευσ., Jno. vii. 51 ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ where ὁ νόμος is to be repeated, which is personified as a judge; in 1 Jno. v. 16 from αἰτήσει the word αἰτούμενος (θεός) might be supplied as the Subject of δώσει (Lücke) more suitably than αἰτῶν; lastly, in Heb. x. 38 ἐὰν ὑποστείληται it would perhaps be most simple to educe the general term ἄνθρωπος from ὁ δίκαιος.

The Predicate is involved in εἶναι when it signifies *existere*, Matt. xxiii. 30 εἰ ἤμεθα ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων etc., Jno. viii. 58; Rev. xxi. 1 ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι. In this sense adverbs are then annexed for closer specification in 1 Cor. vii. 26 καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι.

§ 59. EXTENSION OF A SIMPLE SENTENCE IN ITS SUBJECT AND PREDICATE: ATTRIBUTIVES, APPOSITION.

1. The Subject and the Predicate of a proposition may be extended in a great variety of ways by adjuncts: And first of all *attributively*, most commonly by means of adjectives, see no. 2. Personal nouns in particular which denote office, character, etc., receive, with little extension of signification, general personal 546
attributives in the substantives ἄνθρωπος, ἀνήρ, γυνή etc. (Mtth. 967) Matt. xviii. 23 ὡμοιώθη ... ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ, xiii. 45; xx. 1; xxi. 33 (Iliad. 16, 263 ἄνθρωπος ὀδίτης, Xen. Cyr. 8, 7, 14; Plato, Gorg. 518 c.); Acts iii. 14 ἠτήσασθε ἄνδρα φονέα χαρισθῆναι ὑμῖν, i. 16; Luke xxiv. 19 (Plat. Ion. p. 540 d. ἀνὴρ στρατηγός, Thuc. 464
1, 74; Palaeph. 28, 2 ἀνὴρ ἁλιεύς, 38, 2; Plat. rep. 10, 620 b.; Xen. 6th ed.
Hi. 11, 1; see Fischer ind. ad Palaeph. sub ἀνήρ, Vechner, Hellenol. p. 188. Cf. on the Hebrew idiom, my Simonis p. 54.). On the other hand, in 1 Cor. ix. 5 γυναῖκα is to be taken predicatively; it would be wrong, also, to refer to this head passages in which the attributive is strictly an adjective, as in Acts i. 11; xvii. 12; xxi. 9 (Nep. 25, 9); Jno. iv. 9. In the addresses ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται Acts ii. 22, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι xvii. 22; xix. 35 the emphasis lies on ἄνδρες, and renders the address one of respect (cf. Xen. An. 3, 2, 2). Similar forms of address are frequent in the Greek orators.

2. Adjectives (and participles) annexed to substantives attributively to supplement their meaning regularly stand *after* them, Luke ix. 37 συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς, Rev. xvi. 2 ἐγένετο ἕλκος 488
κακὸν καὶ πονηρόν, Matt. iii. 4; Jno. ii. 6; 2 Tim. iv. 7 τὸν ἀγῶνα 7th ed.
τὸν καλὸν ἠγώνισμαι, Luke v. 36 ff.; Phil. iv. 1; Rev. vi. 12, 13, since the thing itself presents itself to the mind before its Predi-

cate. When, however, the adjective is to receive any degree of prominence, as directly or indirectly antithetical, it is put *before* the substantive; and this is peculiarly frequent in the didactic style: Matt. xiii. 24 *ὡμοιώθη ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ σπείραντι καλὸν σπέρμα* (vs. 25 *ἔσπειρεν ζιζάνια*), Luke viii. 15 *τὸ (πεσὸν) ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῇ* (vss. 12, 13, 14); Jno. ii. 10 *πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον τίθησιν, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθῶσιν, τότε τὸν ἐλάσσω* (Rom. i. 23; xiii. 3; Mark i. 45; Matt. xii. 35); 1 Cor. v. 6 *ὅτι μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ* (Jas. iii. 5); 1 Pet. iv. 10 *ἕκαστος καθὼς ἔλαβεν χάρισμα εἰς ἑαυτοὺς αὐτὸ διακονοῦντες ὡς καλοὶ οἰκονόμοι* (the *κακοὶ οἰκ.* do not do so), Heb. x. 29 (cf. vs. 28); viii. 6; Rom. vi. 12 *μὴ βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι* (just because the *σῶμα* is *θνητόν*, it would be absurd to allow such dominion), 2 Pet. i. 4; Mark xiv. 6; Heb. ix. 11, 12; 1 Tim. i. 19; 1 Cor. v. 7; 2 Cor. v. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 10, 19. Hence in the apostolic diction *καινὴ κτίσις*, *καινὸς ἄνθρωπος*, and for the most part *ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*. But even the adjective put after the substantive may be emphatic when made prominent by the article, Jno. iv. 11 *πόθεν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν;* x. 11 *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός*, or when placed at the end of the sentence, as in Mark ii. 21 *οὐδεὶς . . . ἐπιῤάπτει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν*, Jno. xix. 41; Mark xvi. 17 *γλώσσαις*
547 *λαλήσουσι καιναῖς*. In one and the same verse we find an adjective preceding and another following the substantive, Tit. iii. 9 *μωρὰς ζητήσεις . . . μάχας νομικάς*. In general, it must not be forgotten that it often depends on the writer whether he will emphasize the adjective or not. Thus in Jno. xiii. 34; 1 Jno. ii. 7, 8 *καινὴν ἐντολήν* might have been put in distinct antithesis to the old commandments, but the Apostle says *ἐντολὴν καινήν*, a commandment which is new. In Rev. iii. 12 we find *τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσ.* but xxi. 2 *Ἱερουσ. καινήν*; and in 2 Pet. iii. 13 *καινοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ γῆν καινήν*, it was sufficient to emphasize the adjective by position merely the first time. In Acts vii. 36; Heb. xi. 29 we find *ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα*, but in the Sept. frequently *θάλασσα ἐρυθρά*.

When two or more adjectives connected by *καί* belong to *one* substantive, they are put before or after it, in accordance with the preceding distinc-
465 tions, as in 1 Tim. ii. 2 *ἵνα ἤρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον διάγωμεν*, Matt. xxv. 21
6th ed. *δοῦλε ἀγαθὲ καὶ πιστέ*, Luke xxiii. 50 *ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος*, Acts xi. 24; Rev. iii. 14; xvi. 2. Such arrangements of words as in Matt. xxiv. 45 *ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος*, Heb. x. 34, are to be accounted for by the circumstance, that the writer afterwards introduces a second adjective to complete the sense, or has reserved it for the end of the sentence for the sake of force.

3. Two or more adjectives regularly are connected by *καί* and joined to their substantives, 1 Pet. i. 4 *εἰς κληρονομίαν ἄφθαρτον καὶ ἀμίαντον καὶ ἀμάραντον*, vs. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 14 etc. When the copula is omitted, it is either because the intention of the writer 489
is to enumerate single qualities separately deserving of attention 7th ed.
(§ 58, 6) 1 Tim. iii. 2 ff. *δεῖ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίλημπτον εἶναι, νηφάλιον, σώφρονα, κόσμιον* etc. Tit. i. 6; ii. 4 f.; Phil. ii. 2; Rev. v. 1 (Job i. 8) see § 58, 7, perhaps with climax Luke vi. 38 (Mtth. 998); or because one of the adjectives is more closely related to the substantive, and forms with it as it were *one* notion, 1 Pet. i. 18 *ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ὑμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου*, Jno. xii. 3 *μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου*, where *νάρδος πιστική* designates, commercially as it were, a certain sort of spikenard, which is then declared to be *πολύτιμος*, Jno. xvii. 3 *ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν*, Gal. i. 4; 1 Cor. x. 4; Rev. i. 16; ii. 12; xii. 3; xv. 6; xx. 11, (which is sometimes obvious from the mere position of the words, as in Jno. vii. 37 *ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς*, Heb. ix. 11). Cf. Her. 7, 23 *σῖτος πολλὸς ἐφοίτα ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας ἀληλεσμένος*, Dion. H. IV. 2097 *συναγαγόντες ἰδιωτικὸν συνέδριον πατρικόν*, see Mtth. 998; Dissen, Pindar. ed. Goth. 303 sq.; 548
Hm. Eurip. Hec. p. 54; Elmsley, Eurip. Med. 807; Bornem. Xen. Cyr. p. 71; cf. (Nep. 25, 9, 14; Cic. parad. 5, 2) Kritz, Sallust. Jug. 172. (When the second Predicate is a real participle, a connecting *καί* is of course not to be expected, Acts xxvii. 6 *εὑρὼν πλοῖον Ἀλεξανδρῖνον πλέον εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν*, Mark xiv. 15; Rev. x. 1.)

When *πολύς* is annexed to a substantive that already has an adjective, it will either be construed according to the preceding rule, as in Jno. x. 32 *πολλὰ καλὰ ἔργα ἔδειξα*, 1 Tim. vi. 9, or written as in Acts xxv. 7 *πολλά τε καὶ βαρέα αἰτιώματα*, where the word expressing the quality is made prominent: *many and* (that, too,) *heavy* etc. Cf. Her. 4, 167; 8, 61; Xen. Mem. 2, 9, 6; Lys. 26, 1, see Mtth. 998. Under this head come also Jno. xx. 30 *πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα* (but xxi. 25 *ἄλλα πολλά*), and Luke iii. 18 *πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα* (which is not unknown also in Greek authors, see Kypke on the first passage) *many and other*, for which we say *many other*.

4. From the natural rule, that an adjective must agree with its substantive in gender and number, there is sometimes a deviation, when the writer allows regard for the thought to prevail over that for the grammatical form. That is

a. Neuter or Feminine substantives that signify persons have Masculine adjectives joined to them (Hm. Vig. p. 715), Rev.

xix. 14 *τὰ στρατεύματα . . . ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ . . . ἐνδεδυμένοι βύσσινον λευκὸν καθαρόν*, v. 6; Eph. iv. 17, 18; 1 Cor. xii. 2; Mark ix. 26 (Xen. Mem. 2, 2, 3 *αἱ πόλεις . . . ὡς παύσοντες*, Cyr. 1, 2,
466 12; 7, 3, 8; Joseph. antt. 6, 11, 6; cf. Liv. 7, 2; still more bold
6th ed. is Aristid. I. 267 extr. Jebb. *ἄμιλλα καὶ σπουδὴ τῶν ἑκατέρωθεν μεγίστων πόλεων, καλούντων τι ὡς αὐτούς*), Rev. xi. 15 *ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι . . . λέγοντες* (v. 13 f.); iv. 8 *τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα, ἓν καθ' ἓν αὐτῶν ἔχων ἀνὰ πτέρυγας ἕξ . . . καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς λέγοντες*.

In Eph. iv. 18 *ἐσκοτισμένοι* does not belong to the subordinate clause
490 *καθὼς καὶ τὰ ἔθνη*, but to *ὑμᾶς*; and 2 Jno. 4 *εὕρηκα ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου*
7th ed. *περιπατοῦντας* only borders upon the above usage.

b. Collectives (cf. § 58, 4) in the Sing. sometimes have adjectives after them in the Plural, as in Acts v. 16 *συνήρχετο τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων Ἱερ. φέροντες ἀσθενεῖς* etc. (xxi. 36; Luke xix. 37; cf. Diod. S. 5, 43; Xen. Eph. 1, 3; Palairet, observ. p. 201); iii. 11 *συνέδραμεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς . . . ἔκθαμβοι*, Jno. xii. 12; Rev. vii. 9; xix. 1 (Philostr. Apoll. 2, 12); Luke ii. 13 *πλῆθος*
549 *στρατιᾶς οὐρανίου αἰνούντων τὸν θεόν* etc. On the other hand, in Rev. iii. 9 *τῶν λεγόντων* is not an epithet of *συναγωγῆς*, but to be taken partitively. The Sing. and Plural connected, occur in Mark viii. 1 *παμπόλλου ὄχλου ὄντος καὶ μὴ ἐχόντων, τί φάγωσι*, Acts xxi. 36; cf. Diod. S. 14, 78 *τοῦ πλήθους συντρέχοντος . . . καὶ τοὺς μισθοὺς πρότερον ἀπαιτούντων*, Virg. Aen. 2, 64 undique visendi studio Trojana juventus circumfusa ruit certantque illudere capto. Further, see Poppo Thuc. I. 102 sq.; Bornem. Xen. Apol. p. 36; Anab. p. 354; Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 811; Hm. Lucian. conscr. hist. p. 301; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 103 sq.; Mtth. 976 f.

Noteworthy is the connection of two genders in Rev. xiv. 19 *ἔβαλεν εἰς τὴν ληνὸν τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν μέγαν*, as even Tdf. reads, (*ληνός* is sometimes Masc., Sept. Gen. xxx. 38, 41, Vat.).[1] But in Acts xi. 28 Luke undoubtedly wrote *λιμὸν μεγάλην . . . ἥτις*, see Bornem. in loc. In Phil. ii. 1 all recent editors [with the exception of Lchm. and Tdf. 7th ed.] have substituted *εἴ τινα* for *εἴ τις σπλάγχνα*.

5. When an adjective refers to two or more substantives of different genders or numbers, it is

a. Usually repeated with each substantive, as in Mark xiii. 1 *ἴδε*

[1] *Lücke* (Apokal. II. 464) wants either to read with a single Codex *τοῦ μεγάλου* (which is probably a correction), or to assume a constructio ad sensum, the writer in using *τὸν μέγαν* having thought only of *θυμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. *Lücke* himself confesses that the latter assumption is pretty violent and harsh. See also *Matthäi's* small edition, p. 63.

ποταποὶ λίθοι καὶ ποταπαὶ οἰκοδομαί, Jas. i. 17 πᾶσα δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ πᾶν δώρημα τέλειον, Rev. xxi. 1 οὐρανὸν καινὸν καὶ γῆν καινήν, Jno. xi. 33; Acts iv. 7; 1 Cor. xiii. 2; Eph. i. 21; 1 Pet. ii. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 13 (3 Esr. iii. 5); cf. Aristot. Nicom. 7, 9, 1; Demosth. pac. 23 b. Or

b. Used only once: preceding, in the gender and number of the first substantive, Luke x. 1 εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον, 1 Thess. v. 23; Rev. xiii. 7; vi. 14; vii. 9; cf. Diod. S. 1, 4 μετὰ πολλῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ κινδύνων, Dem. Con. 728 a.; Plutarch. mor. 993 a.; on the other hand, when placed after the substantives, it is sometimes in the Plur. and sometimes in the Sing., and its gender is that of the nearest or principal substantive, as in Heb. ix. 9 δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίαι προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι etc. iii. 6 ἐὰν τὴν παῤῥησίαν καὶ τὸ καύχημα μέχρι τέλους βεβαίαν κατάσχωμεν (var.), Rev. viii. 7. Cf. Iliad. 2, 136 sq. αἱ ἡμέτεραί τ' ἄλοχοι καὶ νήπια τέκνα εἶατ' ἐνὶ μεγάροις ποτιδέγμεναι, Thuc. 8, 63 πυθόμενος . . . καὶ τὸν Στρομβιχίδην καὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀπεληλυθότα, Xen. Cyr. 7, 5, 60. If the substantives are of the same gender, or if the adjective employed has not different forms to express different genders, it is usually expressed but once; — with the first substantive as in Acts ii. 43; Matt. iv. 24; Mark ii. 15; Eph. i. 21; 1 Cor. xi. 30 (2 Pet. i. 10); Rev. vi. 15, or with the second as in 2 Cor. . 6. 467 6th ed. 550 491 7th ed.

The Plural of an adjective which belongs to two substantives may appear to be used in 1 Pet. i. 18 οὐ φθαρτοῖς ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ ἐλυτρώθητε; but φθαρτ. must be regarded as a substantive, and ἀργ. and χρ. as explanatory specifications in apposition to it: *not with corruptible things, silver or gold* etc.

6. *Predicative* amplifications, which we introduce by *as* or *for*, *to*, are very frequent: 1 Tim. ii. 7 εἰς ὃ ἐτέθην ἐγὼ κῆρυξ, 1 Cor. x. 6 ταῦτα τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, vs. 11; xv. 26; Matt. i. 18; Jno. iii. 2; xii. 46; 2 Tim. i. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 5 αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ζῶντες οἰκοδομεῖσθε οἶκος πνευματικός, 1 Cor. ix. 5 ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα περιάγειν, Rom. iii. 25 ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον, Jas. v. 10 ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε . . . τοὺς προφήτας, Acts vii. 10; xix. 19; xx. 28; xxv. 14; xxvi. 5; Luke xx. 43; 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 1 Jno. iv. 10, 14 (2 Thess. ii. 13 according to the reading ἀπαρχήν) Heb. i. 2; xii. 9; 2 Pet. iii. 1; Rev. xiv. 4. Sometimes such a Predicate is made prominent by the comparative particle ὡς, as in 2 Cor. x. 2 λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας, 1 Cor. iv. 1; cf. 2 Thess. iii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 1 f.; or the Hebraistic construction with εἰς is adopted, as in Acts xiii. 22 ἤγειρεν τὸν Δαυὶδ αὐτοῖς εἰς

βασιλέα, vs. 47 ; vii. 21 ; see p. 228. On making the Predicate precede, see § 61.

The Predicate is sometimes an adjective, as in Heb. vii. 24 ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην, Mark viii. 17 ; Heb. v. 14 ; 1 Cor. xii. 22 ; Matt. xii. 13 ἀπεκατεστάθη (ἡ χεὶρ) ὑγιής, Acts xiv. 10 ; xxvii. 43 ; xxviii. 13 ; Rom. x. 19 ; 1 Cor. iv. 9 ; ix. 17 ; Mark iv. 28 ; or a pronoun, as in Rom. ix. 24 οὓς (σκεύη ἐλέους) καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς, Jno. iv. 23 ; Heb. x. 20. On the other hand, a Predicate is sometimes annexed to a pronoun, as in 1 Pet. iii. 21 ὃ (ὕδωρ) καὶ ὑμᾶς ἀντίτυπον νῦν σώζει.

Such Predicates are sometimes to be taken proleptically (Bornem. Luc. p. 39 ; Krü. 210), as in Matt. xii. 13 ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγιὴς i.e. ὥστε γενέσθαι ὑγιῆ (Luke xiii. 35 var.) Phil. iii. 21 ; 1 Cor. i. 8 ; 1 Thess. iii. 13.

551 7. Especially diversified are the *appositive* adjuncts,[1] which, an-
468 nexed asyndetically, are intended mainly to define more closely one
6th ed. nominal (or pronominal) notion by another. But apposition is,
492 a. *Synthetic*, in the case of proper names which are distin-
7th ed. guished by the species or genus, or, if they belong in common to a plurality of persons or of objects, by a distinctive quality : Matt. iii. 6 ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ, Heb. xii. 22 προσεληλύθατε Σιὼν ὄρει, Acts x. 32 οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος βυρσέως, Heb. vii. 4 δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν . . . ὁ πατριάρχης, Acts xxi. 39 ; Rev. ii. 24.

b. *Partitive* (Rost 484) : 1 Cor. vii. 7 ἕκαστος ἴδιον ἔχει χάρισμα, ὁ μὲν οὕτως, ὁ δὲ οὕτως, Matt. xxii. 5 ; Acts xvii. 32 ; xxvii. 44, more simply in Acts ii. 6 ἤκουον εἷς ἕκαστος τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ etc., Eph. iv. 25.

c. *Parathetic*, when some characteristic of a person or thing is expressed : Luke xxiii. 50 Ἰωσήφ, ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος, Jno. xiii. 14 εἰ ἐγὼ ἔνιψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος, viii. 40 ; Heb. ix. 24 ; Acts xxii. 12 ; Jas. i. 8 ; Matt. xiv. 20 ; Rom. vii. 19 ; cf. 1 Pet. v. 1, etc.

d. *Epexegetic*, when a more precise expression is added, which we should introduce by *namely*, *that is to say* : Eph. i. 7 ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν (vs. 10) τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν . . . τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων, 1 Pet. v. 8 ὁ ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν, διάβολος, Eph. i. 13 ; ii. 15 ; iv. 13 ; Phil. iv. 18 ; 1 Cor. v. 7 ; 2 Cor. v. 1 ; vii. 6 ; Rom. viii. 23 ; Jno. vi. 27 ; vii. 2 ; Mark xii. 44 ; Acts viii. 38 ; 1 Jno. v. 20 ; Jude 4 ; Rev. xii. 1, etc. So also after pronouns, as in Jno. ix. 13

[1] Well-considered views are contained in *J. D. Weickert's* Progr. on Apposition in German, Lübben, 1829. 4to. Further, cf. *Mehlhorn* de Appositione in Graeca ling. Glog. 1838 (*Sommer* in the Zeitschr. für Alterthumswiss. 1839. nr. 125 f.), *Rost*, Gramm. 482 f.

ἄγουσιν αὐτὸν . . . τόν ποτε τυφλόν, 1 Thess. iv. 3 *τοῦτό ἐστι θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμὸς ὑμῶν* (Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 15; Plat. rep. 9, 583 d.; Gorg. 478 c.); 2 Cor. ii. 1 *ἔκρινα ἐμαυτῷ τοῦτο, τὸ μὴ . . . ἐλθεῖν* (Rost 486); Eph. i. 19 *εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντας*, Rom. xiv. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 9; Phil. iii. 3; Jas. i. 27; 1 Pet. i. 21; ii. 7 (2 Pet. iii. 2); 1 Jno. ii. 16; iii. 24[1] etc. (Bornem. Luc. p. 114 sq.); 1 Cor. xvi. 21 *ὁ ἀσπασμὸς τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ Παύλου* i.e. *τῇ χειρί μου Π.* (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 74; Krü. 213 f.; Rost 483; cf. Cic. parad. 4, 8; Fam. 5, 12; Liv. 4, 2; 7, 40). Appositive adjuncts occur even after adverbs, as in Luke iv. 23 *ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου* (Aeschyl. Choeph. 654); Jas. iv. 1 *πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι; οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν ἡδονῶν* etc. Mark viii. 4; Eph. i. 19; 1 Pet. ii. 7, 15. 552

Several words may be joined by apposition to one and the same subject, Rev. xii. 9; xiii. 16; and so sometimes an apposition consists of several parts, 2 Thess. ii. 3 sq. On the other hand, in 2 Pet. ii. 18 we are not (with Lchm. and Tdf.) to find in *τοὺς ἐν πλάνῃ ἀναστρεφομένους* an apposition to *τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας*, but that second Accusative depends on *ἀποφεύγ.* [see Huther and Wiesinger in loc.].

An apposition occurs also in Mark viii. 8 *ἦραν περισσεύματα κλασμάτων* 493
ἑπτὰ σπυρίδας they took up remnants, seven baskets; and in Matt. xvi. 13, 7th ed.
according to the reading *τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;* the last words would be an apposition, see Bornem. Luc. p. LII. To reject *μέ* on the sole authority of Cod. B [and Cod. Sin.] (for versions cannot be counted here) with Fr. [Tdf.] and others [Lchm. puts it in brackets] I consider rash. Mέ here may be cumbersome, but I cannot regard it as inadmissible: who do people say that I, the Son of Man, am? He himself had always styled himself the Son of Man, and now desires to hear what idea the people have of him as the Son of Man. As to other passages, in which the Dutch critics in particular have taken offence at such appositions and made hasty alterations in the text, see Bornem. diss. de glossem. N. T. cap. 5 prefixed to his Scholia on Luke.

We must likewise refer to the head of Apposition the well-known use 469
of *ἄλλος* before a substantive, which occurs not only in Homer, e.g. Odyss. 6th ed.
2, 412 *μήτηρ δ' ἐμοὶ οὔτι πέπυται οὐδ' ἄλλαι δμωαί* i.e. *nor other persons* (that is) *servants*, 1, 132 (cf. Thiersch, Gr. p. 588), but also in prose authors, e.g. Plato, Gorg. 473 c. *εὐδαιμονιζόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν*

[1] The personal pronoun included in a verb takes an apposition in 1 Pet. v. 1 *παρακαλῶ (ἐγὼ) ὁ συμπρεσβύτερος καὶ μάρτυς* etc. cf. Lucian. d. deor. 24. 2; Thuc. 1, 137; Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 42. To this head may be referred also 1 Cor. vi. 11 *ταῦτά τινες ἦτε (ὑμεῖς, τινές you,* i.e. some).

ἄλλων ξένων *and the rest* (namely) *foreigners*, Xen. An. 5, 4, 25 οἱ πολέμιοι ὁμοῦ δὴ πάντες γενόμενοι ἐμάχοντο καὶ ἐξηκόντιζον τοῖς παλτοῖς· καὶ ἄλλα δόρατα ἔχοντες, 1, 5, 5; cf. Elmsley, Eurip. Med. p. 128 sq. Lips.; Jacobs, Athen. p. 22 sq.; Krüger, Dion. p. 139; Poppo, Cyrop. p. 186; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 54 sq.; Zell, Aristot. ethic. p. 62. This is probably not to be applied to Jno. xiv. 16 καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν; but the analogous ἕτερος does appear to be so used in Luke xxiii. 32 ἤγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ ἀναιρεθῆναι, where from the expression Jesus also seems to be called κακοῦργος (cf. x. 1 ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος καὶ ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα δύο). See Thuc. 4, 67; Antiph. 6. 24.

Abbreviation combined with apposition occurs in 2 Cor. vi. 13: τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν πλατύνθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς, instead of τὸ αὐτό, ὅ ἐστιν ἀντιμισθία, see Fr. diss. in 2 Cor. II. 113 sqq.

Epexegetical apposition may likewise be introduced by τοῦτ' ἔστιν, as in Rom. vii. 18 ἐν ἐμοὶ τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου, Acts xix. 4; Mark vii. 2; Heb. ix. 11; xi. 16; xiii. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 20; Philem. 12. An apposition is annexed with emphasis by αὐτός in Eph. v. 23 ὡς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς κεφαλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, αὐτὸς σωτὴρ τοῦ σώματος.

An apposition appears to be incorporated into a relative clause in 1 Jno. ii. 25 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, probably also in Phil. iii. 18 and 2 Cor. x. 13, see Mey. in loc., cf. Plat. Phaed. 66 c. τότε ... ἡμῖν ἔσται οὗ ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ... φρονήσεως, Hipp. maj. 281 c. οἱ παλαιοὶ ἐκεῖνοι; ὧν ὀνόματα μεγάλα λέγεται ... Πιττακοῦ
553 καὶ Βίαντος, ... φαίνονται ἀπεχόμενοι, rep. 3, 402 c.; 7, 533 c.; Apol. p. 41 a.; Lucian. Eunuch. 4.

494 8. That words in apposition, being co-ordinated with their prin-
7th ed. cipals, agree with them in case is the well-known rule. It does not extend to gender or number (Ramshorn, S. 294); since, in particular, a neuter (abstract) may be put in apposition with a personal noun, a plural with a collective singular, a singular with a plural, as Phil. iv. 1 ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί ... χαρὰ καὶ στεφανός μου, 1 Cor. iv. 13; xv. 20; Col. iii. 4; Phil. iv. 18; Rev. i. 6; xvi. 3 (Soph. Oed. C. 472; Eurip. Troad. 432; Plin. epp. 9, 26 Demosthenes, illa norma oratoris et regula, Liv. 1, 20, 3 virgines Vestae, Alba oriundum sacerdotium, 1, 27, 3; 8, 32, 5), 1 Cor. i. 2 τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χρ., τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, 1 Jno. v. 16 δώσει αὐτῷ ζωήν, τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον,[1]
470 cf. 1 Kings xii. 10; Xen. Mem. 2, 3, 2; Hi. 3, 4. Cf. Vig. p. 41.
6th ed.

[1] *Bornemann's* exposition (bibl. Studien der sächs. Geistl. I. 71), according to which αὐτῷ is referred to him that asks, and τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι is taken for a Dativ. commodi (he will give him life for them etc.), appears to me artificial. Αὐτῷ cannot well be referred to ἀδελφὸς ἁμαρτάνων ἁμαρτίαν μὴ πρὸς θάνατον, as αἰτεῖν here manifestly denotes intercession.

Still greater discordance occurs in the apposition contained in Col. iii. 5 *νεκρώσατε τὰ μέλη . . . πορνείαν, ἀκαθαρσίαν* etc., where the vices are placed beside the members employed in the indulgence of them, the results beside the instruments. See Matth. 974. But even from the agreement of the apposition with the noun in case (apart from what has been established above by 1 Cor. xvi. 21), there are exceptions:

a. It is a very common grammatical usage to annex the apposition in the genitive to the noun on which it depends (Bengel on Jno. ii. 21), as in 2 Pet. ii. 6 *πόλεις Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόῤῥας* (Odyss. 1, 2; Thuc. 4, 46; Krü. 97, like urbs Romae, flumen Rheni in Latin, cf. also Hoffmann, Grammat. Syr. p. 298), Luke xxii. 1 *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων* (2 Macc. vi. 7 *Διονυσίων ἑορτή*), ii. 41; Jno. xiii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 5 *τὸν ἀῤῥαβῶνα τοῦ πνεύματος the earnest of the Spirit* (consisting in the Spirit), the Spirit as an earnest (Eph. i. 14), Rom. iv. 11 *σημεῖον ἔλαβε περιτομῆς* (where some authorities give *περιτομήν* as an emendation), Jno. ii. 21; xi. 13; Acts ii. 33; iv. 22; Rom. viii. 21; xv. 16; 1 Cor. v. 8; 2 Cor. v. 1; Eph. ii. 14; vi. 14, 16 f.; Col. iii. 24; Heb. vi. 1; xii. 11; Jas. i. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 3, etc. Under this head comes also Eph. iv. 9 *κατέβη εἰς τὰ κατώτερα (μέρη) τῆς γῆς* (הַתַּחְתִּיּוֹת הָאָרֶץ) *to the lower parts* i.e. the earth, or which constitute the earth (similar is Isa. xxxviii. 14 *εἰς τὸ ὕψος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, cf. Acts ii. 19 *ἐν τῷ* 554
οὐρανῷ ἄνω . . . ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω). The Apostle infers from *ἀνέβη* a *κατέβη*: now Christ strictly and properly came down on earth (and from it ascended again); this, contrasted with heaven, which is here called *ὕψος*, is spoken of as a deep or lower region. Christ's 495
descent into Hades (to which the expression is referred in Evang. 7th ed.
Apocr. p. 445) as an isolated fact cannot here be taken into consideration; it would be too restricted to refer the expression *αἰχμαλωτεύειν αἰχμαλωσίαν* to that. Finally, in Rom. viii. 23 also the interpretation of *ἀπαρχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος the Spirit as first-fruits*, that is, of God's gracious gifts, has not yet been conclusively disproved, even by Mey. and Philippi. The main argument against it, that the Genitive after *ἀπαρχή* is always (in biblical diction? yet cf. Exod. xxvi. 21; Deut. xii. 11, 17) partitive, is merely mechanical. According to this, we could never say: *my first-fruits, first-fruits of the Pentecost* etc. Living languages cannot be pent up within so narrow bounds, cf. Fr. Rom. II. 175. The Spirit is unquestionably a divine gift, as well as *σωτηρία* or *κληρονομία*, and may with perfect propriety be regarded as the first-

fruits of the gifts of God ; and this view is favored by the phrase ἀρραβὼν τοῦ πνεύματος more than Philippi is ready to admit On the other hand, πνεῦμα to signify the fulness of heavenly gifts *hereafter* is not current in biblical usage.[1] As for the rest, the Genitivus
471 appositionis is easily explicable from the nature of the Genitive
7th ed. (*the sign of circumcision*, the Genitive of the closer specification of a general notion), and is not unfrequent in the Oriental idiom (Gesen. Lehrg. 677 ; Ewald 579), while in Greek it appears to be confined to the above geographical expression (and even this is on the whole rare). Not one of the instances adduced from Thuc. by Bauer, Philol. Thuc. Paull. p. 31 sqq., is entirely certain.[2] In Latin, however, cf. besides the expressions, quite usual in ancient languages but unnoticed by the moderns, verbum *scribendi*, vocabulum *silentii*, Cic. off. 2, 5 collectis ceteris causis, eluvionis, pestilentiae, vastitatis rel. (i.e. quae consistunt in eluv., pestilentia, etc.).

555 b. Sometimes we find the Nominative where the structure of the sentence would lead us to expect a different case, as in Jas. iii. 8 τὴν γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δύναται δαμάσαι· ἀκατάστατον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ. The last words are to be regarded as a sort of exclamation, and, therefore, annexed in an independent construction, cf. Mark xii. 40 ; Phil. iii. 18 f. So also might Rev. i. 5 ἀπὸ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστός be taken. In Luke xx. 27 προσελθόντες τινὲς τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι etc., τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων would have been more precise, and nothing is gained
496 by a reference to Bhdy. S. 68 (Mey.). Moreover, the passage
7th ed. (Thuc. 1, 110) adduced by Bornem. in loc. is not entirely analogous. There is, however, some similarity in Corn. Nep. 2, 7 illorum urbem ut propugnaculum *oppositum* esse barbaris, where the gender (as in the above instance the case) is conformed to that, not of the substantive to which it in sense belongs, but of a subordinate substantive. Further, a parallel construction in the N. T. would be Mark vii. 19 according to the reading καθαρίζων. On the other hand, Demosth. Aristocrat. 458 a. ὁρᾷ . . . τῆς πόλεως οἰκοδομήματα καὶ κατασκευάσματα τηλικαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα, ὥστε . . . προπύλαια ταῦτα, νεώσοικοι, στοαί etc. appears to be an intentional

[1] It would be a great mistake to consider as an apposition the second Genitive in Col. ii. 17 ἅ ἐστι σκιὰ τῶν μελλόντων, τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The words are undoubtedly to be so explained as to make Χριστοῦ a part of the predicate, and dependent on ἐστί : *but the body is of Christ, belongs to Christ*, is in, with, Christ.

[2] In the passages adduced by *Mey.* on Eph., as above, [1st. and 2d edns.] from *Erfurdt's* Soph. Antig. 355 and *Schaef.* Apollon. Rhod. schol. p. 235, there is nothing connected with the Gen. apposit.

anacoluthon. And it is in general quite intelligible how even a word in apposition, if it is to be introduced as independent, is put in the Nominative without regard to the construction, — a sort of detached insertion.

In 2 Cor. xi. 28 ἡ ἐπισύστασίς μου etc. is not an abnormal apposition to χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτός — such a solecism is not to be credited to Paul, — but Subject Nominative, and as such rendered prominent.

The apposition to a Vocative stands in the Nominative in Rom. ii. 1 ὦ ἄνθρωπε πᾶς ὁ κρίνων, Rev. xi. 17; xvi. 7; cf. Bar. ii. 12; Acta apocr. p. 51, 60; the epexegesis in these cases is not construed with the Vocative, but introduced independently. Cf. Bhdy. S. 67. In Matt. vi. 9 the adjunct ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς could not have been annexed to πάτερ by means of the article in any other manner than it is, since the article has no Voc. form.

9. An apposition sometimes refers, not merely to single words, but also to *whole clauses* (Erfurdt, Soph. Oed. R. 602; Monk, Eurip. Alcest. 7; Matth. Eurip. Phoen. 223; Sprachl. II. 970 f.; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 228; Krü. 215); and the nouns of which it consists, in the Nom. or Acc. according to the form of the sentence, may then frequently be resolved into an independent proposition (Wannowski, syntax. anom. p. 47 sqq. 197 sq.): 472 6th ed.

a. Substantives in the Acc. (cf. also Lob. paralip. p. 519), as in Rom. xii. 1 παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς, παραστῆσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν, ἁγίαν, εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν, i.e. ἥτις ἐστὶ λογ. λατρ. qui est cultus etc., 1 Tim. ii. 6 ὁ δοὺς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων, τὸ μαρτύριον καιροῖς ἰδίοις; — and in the Nominative, as in 2 Thess. i. 4 f. ὥστε ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐν ὑμῖν καυχᾶσθαι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τοῦ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑπομονῆς ὑμῶν καὶ πίστεως ἐν 556
πᾶσι τοῖς διωγμοῖς ὑμῶν καὶ ταῖς θλίψεσιν, αἷς ἀνέχεσθε, ἔνδειγμα τῆς δικαίας κρίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ etc. (cf. Sueton. Calig. 16 decretum est, ut dies ... Parilia vocaretur, *velut argumentum* rursus conditae urbis, Curt. 4, 7, 13 repente obductae coelo nubes condidere solem, *ingens* aestu fatigatis *auxilium*, Cic. Tusc. 1, 43, 102; Hor. sat. 1, 4, 110; Flor. 3, 21). See Eurip. Orest. 1105; Herc. fur. 59; 497
Electr. 231; Plat. Gorg. 507 d.; as to Latin, Ramshorn 296. 7th ed.
Bengel incorrectly applies this usage to Eph. i. 23 τὸ πλήρωμα etc. where occurs a perfectly simple appositive relation (to σῶμα αὐτοῦ).

b. A Neuter adjective or participle refers to the whole clause in 2 Tim. ii. 14 διαμαρτυρ. ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου μὴ λογομαχεῖν, εἰς οὐδὲν χρήσιμον, Mark vii. 19 καὶ εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα *which* (namely ἐκπορ. εἰς τ. ἀφ.) *purges all sorts of food;* yet see above, 8 b. cf. § 66, 3 g. (On the other hand,

we must not with Mey. take *ἀνακαλυπτόμενον* in 2 Cor. iii. 14 for such an impersonal apposition; it is an attributive to *κάλυμμα*.)

In Rev. xxi. 17 *μέτρον ἀνθρώπου* is annexed as a loose apposition to *ἐμέτρησε τὸ τεῖχος* etc. A construction similar, but not exactly the same, is adduced by Mdv. S. 23.

10. The word in apposition naturally follows the main substantive, but for the sake of emphasis is sometimes separated from it by several intervening words; as, 1 Cor. v. 7 *τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐτύθη, Χριστός*, Rom. viii. 28; 2 Cor. vii. 6; Heb. vii. 4; Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 144; Weber, Demosth. p. 152; Jas. i. 7 f. *μὴ οἰέσθω ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι λήψεταί τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου, ἀνὴρ δίψυχος, ἀκατάστατος* etc. we say *he, a double-minded man.* Rom. vii. 21 does not belong here; and as to 2 Cor. xi. 2 see Mey. against Fr. The apposition *precedes*, for an obvious reason, in 1 Pet. iii. 7 *οἱ ἄνδρες συνοικοῦντες ... ὡς ἀσθενεστέρῳ σκεύει τῷ γυναικείῳ*. But of a different nature is, for example, Tit. i. 3 *κατ' ἐπιταγὴν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ*. Here the Predicate *σωτὴρ ἡμῶν* is the principal noun, but is explained epexegetically (since elsewhere Christ is so called) by the appositive *θεός*. So also in Rom. iv. 12; 1 Tim. ii. 3; 2 Tim. i. 10; Acts xxiv. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 15; v. 8; 2 Pet. i. 11; ii. 20 (iii. 7); Rev. ix. 11; Jno. vi. 27; Luke ii. 1; Jude 4; Heb. ii. 9; cf. Aeschin. ep. 6, p. 124 b.; Paus. 1, 10, 5; Alciphr. 3, 41; D. S. exc. Vat. p. 60. Frequently also in Latin, as in Cic. orat. 1, 18; Liv. 1, 14; 10, 35; 27, 1; Caes. b. gall. 4, 1, 10; afr. 98; Suet. Tib. 2; Galb. 4; Otho 1; Nep. 20, 1; 22, 3.

557 Under this head come also adjectives or substantives placed at the beginning of a sentence, when corresponding to epexegetical apposition
473 they herald the contents of the sentence (Krü. 215 f; Mdv. 229): Heb. viii. 1
6th ed. *κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα* (Lycurg. orat. 17, 6), where it is not necessary to supply *ἐστί*. Cf. Rom. viii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 8.

11. In conclusion, we must advert to the irregularities (solecisms) of government and apposition which occur in the Revelation (especially in the descriptions of visions), and which, from their number and nature, give the style the impress of considerable harshness; see, besides the well-known works of Stolberg and
498 Schwarz (see above, p. 8), my exeget. Stud. I. 164 ff.[1] They are
7th ed.

[1] What *Hitzig* (on Joh. Marcus. Zürich, 1843. 8vo. S. 65 ff.) has collected respecting the language of the Revelation, serves a special critical purpose, and too much is put down to the account of the Hebrew element. A more moderate view is taken by *Lücke*, Apokal. II. 448 ff., who, however, in this particular sets too high a value on *Hitzig's* merits.

partly intended, and partly traceable to the writer's negligence. From a Greek point of view they may be explained as instances of anacoluthon, blending of two constructions, constructio ad sensum, variatio structurae, as should always have been done, instead of attributing them to the ignorance of the author, or pronouncing them to be mere Hebraisms, since most of them would be anomalies even in Hebrew, and in producing many of them Hebrew could have had only an indirect and incidental influence. But with all his simplicity and Oriental tone of diction, the author understands and observes very well the rules of Greek syntax, and even in imitating Hebrew expressions proceeds judiciously (Lücke S. 447). Besides, examples analogous to many of these irregularities occur in the Sept., and even in Greek authors; though certainly not in such thick succession as in the Revelation. In reference to particulars we remark:

Rev. ii. 20 is probably to be construed thus: *ὅτι ἀφεῖς τὴν γυναῖκά σου Ἰεζάβελ· ἡ λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν προφῆτιν καὶ διδάσκει καὶ πλανᾷ* etc. *who, while she pretends to be a prophetess, teaches and seduces* etc. The blending of two constructions explains vii. 9 *εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολὺς ... ἑστῶτες ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου ... περιβεβλημένους* (where the writer, in using the Nom. had *ἰδού*, and in using the Acc. *περιβ.* had *εἶδον*, in his mind, and blended both constructions together, cf. iv. 4; xiv. 14; Judith x. 7; Stallb. Plat. Euthyphr. p. 32).[1] In Rev. v. 11 f. *ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἀγγέλων* 558
... καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν μυριάδες μυριάδων ... λέγοντες, the last word does not refer to *μυριάδες* but to *ἄγγελοι* (as the words *καὶ ἦν ... μυρ.* are to be considered parenthetical), as if the writer had commenced *φωνὴν ἐπῆραν ἄγγελοι* etc. (Similar are Thuc. 7, 42 *τοῖς Συρακουσίοις ... κατάπληξις οὐκ ὀλίγη ἐγένετο ... ὁρῶντες*, Achill. Tat. 6, 13 *πειρατήριον ταῦτα εἶναί σοι δοκεῖ ... ἄνδρα τοιοῦτον λαβοῦσα*, Plat. Phaed. p. 81 a. *οὐκοῦν οὕτω μὲν* 474
ἔχουσα εἰς τὸ ὅμοιον αὐτῇ τὸ ἀειδὲς ἀπέρχεται τὸ θεῖόν τε ..., οἷ 6th ed.
ἀφικομένῃ ὑπάρχει αὐτῇ εὐδαίμονι εἶναι, πλάνης ... ἀπηλλαγμένῃ, ὥσπερ δὲ λέγεται κατὰ τῶν μεμυημένων, ὡς ἀληθῶς τὸν λοιπὸν χρόνον μετὰ θεῶν διάγουσα, instead of *διαγούσῃ*.) Elsewhere we 499
find *λέγων, λέγοντες* iv. 1; ix. 13 sq.; xi. 15 with *φωνή, φωναί* etc., the 7th ed.
reference being to the speakers themselves. *Λέγων* is even used

[1] In Rev. xiv. 14 *εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ νεφέλη λευκὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν νεφέλην καθήμενον ὅμοιον υἱῷ ἀνθρώπου, ἔχων* etc., probably *καθήμενον* is not the Acc. Masc., but the Neuter used substantively: on the cloud something like unto a human being etc. Afterwards the construction immediately passes into the Masculine.

quite absolutely xi. 1 ; xiv. 7 ; xix. 6, as in the Sept. corresponding to לֵאמֹר Gen. xv. 1 ; xxii. 20 ; xxxviii. 13 ; xlv. 16 ; xlviii. 2 ; Exod. v. 14 ; Josh. x. 17 ; Judges xvi. 2 ; 1 Sam. xv. 12 ; 1 Kings xii. 10, (and even Rev. v. 12 might be so taken). The anomalous apposition (§ 59, 8 b.) in Rev. iii. 12 appears more strange: *τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου, τῆς καινῆς Ἱερ., ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . καὶ τὸ ὄνομα μου τὸ καινόν* (where, however, *ἡ καταβαίνουσα* etc., as it cannot well be taken for a Nominat. tituli, interrupts the structure as a significant parenthesis, as if for *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ κατ.*); and that also in xiv. 12 *ὧδε ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐστίν· οἱ τηροῦντες τὰς ἐντολάς* etc. (i. 5), where there is an abrupt transition to a new sentence, somewhat as in Jas. iii. 8 *τὴν γλῶσσαν οὐδεὶς δύναται ἀνθρώπων δαμάσαι, ἀκατάσχετον κακόν, μεστὴ ἰοῦ θανατηφόρου.* Likewise in Rev. viii. 9 *ἀπέθανεν τὸ τρίτον τῶν κτισμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ, τὰ ἔχοντα ψυχάς*, ix. 14 ; xvi. 3 probably the apposition is purposely inserted in an independent form ; see besides xx. 2. In Rev. xxi. 11 f. there is a repeated change of construction : first we find *καταβαίνουσαν* regularly construed with *τὴν πόλιν* vs. 10 ; then follows *ὁ φωστήρ* etc., as an independent parenthetic clause ; vs. 12 reverts to *πόλις*, but the attributive forms part of a new sentence, *ἔχουσα* etc. Cf. Cic. Brut. 35 Q. Catulus non antiquo more sed hoc nostro . . . eruditus ; multae literae, summa . . . comitas etc. On the combination of two constructions, each of which is allowable, in xviii. 12 f. ; xix. 12, see § 63 II. 1. That in xvii. 14 [?] is less harsh. In i. 5 f. *τῷ ἀγαπῶντι* etc. is connected with *αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα* etc. ; the author, however, instead of writing *καὶ ποιήσαντι* etc., inserts this thought as an independent clause. The connection of two genders in xiv. 19 we noticed above, no. 4 b. Still more singular is the construction in xi. 4 *οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο ἐλαῖαι καὶ αἱ δύο λυχνίαι αἱ ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου ἑστῶτες* (for *ἑστῶσαι* is manifestly a correction), v. 6
559 (iv. 8 ; xiv. 1 var.) ; the attributives, however, are construed ad sensum, since the substantives denote living creatures of the masculine gender. As to i. 4 see p. 68.

(Inaccuracies of a different kind have been occasionally noticed in the previous part of this Grammar. With *διδάσκειν τινί* p. 227, may be classed xix. 5 *αἰνεῖν τῷ θεῷ*. The conjunction *ἵνα* is frequently in good Codd. — p. 289 sq. — construed with the Indic. Present, xiii. 17 ; xx. 3.)

§ 60. CONNECTION OF SENTENCES: PERIODS.[1]

500 7th ed.

1. In continued discourse, connection between propositions is the rule; want of connection (asyndeton), the exception. The latter is sometimes grammatical, and sometimes rhetorical. 475 6th ed.

a. Absence of grammatical connection occurs not only with sentences which begin new (i.e. the larger) sections, the commencement of which the want of connection is intended to indicate, as in Rom. ix. 1; x. 1; xiii. 1; Gal. iii. 1; iv. 21; vi. 1; Eph. vi. 1, 5, 10; Phil. iv. 1, 4; 1 Tim. iii. 1, 14; v. 1; vi. 1, 3; 2 Tim. ii. 14; iv. 1; 1 Pet. v. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 1; 1 Jno. ii. 1; iv. 1 f.; but also in uninterrupted discourse in the case of individual sentences, sometimes in narration where mere sequence passes for chronological connection, sometimes in the didactic style, particularly with injunctions, maxims and the like, which, although running on one common thread of discourse, yet present themselves as individually independent. The former class are of most frequent occurrence in John, and constitute one of the peculiarities of that writer's style, cf. the oft-recurring λέγει or εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ i. 38, 40, 42, 44, 46 f. 49, 52; ii. 4 f. 7, 8; iii. 3; iv. 7, 11, 15, 17, 19, 21, 25, 26, 34, 50; i. 26, 49 f.; ii. 19; iii. 3, 5, 9, 10, iv. 13, 17; though it is not to be denied that by asyndeton (cf. xx. 26; xxi. 3), especially where it runs through several verses, the narration gains much in liveliness and impressiveness (as it is often accompanied with the praesens historicus), Jno. iii. 3–5; iv. 9–11, 15–17; v. 6–8; xx. 14–18, and the grammatical asyndeton is combined with the rhetorical.

Didactic asyndeton occurs in the sermon on the mount, Matt. v. vi. and vii., also in James, but most frequently in John (in Christ's discourses and in the 1st Epistle). The discourse incessantly 560 begins anew, as it were; and in translating, it is unjustifiable to insert a connecting particle. Cf. Jno. ii. 7; iii. 30–33; v. 43, 45; vii. 17, 18; x. 3, 4, 17 f.; xv. 2–24; 1 Jno. i. 6, 8–10; ii. 4, 6, 9 f. 15, 18 f.; iii. 1 f. 4–10, 18–20; iv. 4–10, 12; v. 1 f. 5 f. 9 f. 12, 16–19; Jas. i. 16–18; iv. 7–10; v. 1–6, 8–10; Rom. xii. 9, 14, 16, 21; 1 Tim. iv. 11–16; v. 14, 22–24; Matt. x. 8.

2. b. *Rhetorical* asyndeton, of which even Longinus 19; Gregor. Cor. in Walz rhet. graeci VII. II. 1211; Quintil. institut. 9, 3, 50 sq. treat, and which is correctly classed among rhetorical figures

[1] *Schleiermacher*, Hermeneutik, S. 116 f.

(Glassii philol. sacra I. 512 sq.; Bauer, rhetor. Paull. II. 591 sqq.;
501 cf. Hand, lat. Styl. p. 302),[1] is naturally found more frequently in
7th ed. the epistles than in the historical books of the N. T., but has not always been considered by expositors from the right point of view. Since it produces in general a sharp and rapid advance in the discourse, it gives to the style liveliness and force. The following
476 different sorts of rhetorical asyndeton (Bhdy. S. 448; Kühner II.
6th ed. 459 f.) between sentences (for as to asyndeton within a sentence, see § 58, 7) may be distinguished. The connecting particles are omitted,

a) When in impassioned discourse a series of parallel clauses are annexed to each other; particularly in a climax (Reiz and Lehmann on Lucian v. hist. 2 § 35), where the repetition of the connective would make the discourse drag. Mark iv. 39 *σιώπα, πεφίμωσο*, 1 Cor. iv. 8 *ἤδη κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ· ἤδη ἐπλουτήσατε, χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε*, xiii. 4–8; xiv. 26; 1 Thess. v. 14; 1 Pet. ii. 17; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 2 Cor. vii. 2; Jas. v. 6; 1 Pet. v. 10 etc. Similar is Demosth. Phil. 4, p. 54 a.; Pantaen. 626 a.; Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 38; Weber, Demosth. p. 363.

b) In antitheses, where the force of the contrast is thus made to strike the reader more pointedly: 1 Cor. xv. 43 f. *σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ, σπείρεται ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δυνάμει, σπείρ. σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἐγείρ. σῶμα πνευματικόν*, Jas. i. 19 *πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, βραδὺς εἰς τὸ λαλῆσαι*, cf. further, Mark xvi. 6; Jno. iv. 22; vi. 63; viii. 41, Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 144 and Plat. Protag. p. 52. So, in general, in the counterpoising of sentences, as Acts xxv. 12 *καίσαρα ἐπικέκλησαι, ἐπὶ καίσαρα πορεύσῃ*, cf. Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 464.

561 c) Especially when a reason or explanation is subjoined to a statement (Krü. p. 223), or an application or exhortation is deduced from what has been said (Stallb. Plat. Alcib. 2 p. 319), Rev. xxii. 10 *μὴ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· ὁ καιρὸς ἐγγύς ἐστιν*, Jno. iv. 24; viii. 18; xvii. 17; Rom. vi. 9; 1 Cor. vii. 4, 15; 2 Cor. xii. 11; Rev. xvi. 6, 15; 1 Pet. v. 8; 2 Pet. ii. 16 (Rev. xiv. 5 var.); Heb. iii. 12 *βλέπετε* (cf. vss. 7–11) *μήποτε ἔσται ἔν τινι ὑμῶν καρδία πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας*, 1 Cor. vi. 18; v. 7, 13; vii. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 30 (see Mey.); Jno. xii. 35.

[1] See *Dissen* 2 excurs. to the Gotha ed. of Pindar; also *Hm.* in *Jahn's* Jahrbb. I. 54 ff.; further *Nägelsbach's* Notes on the Iliad, p. 266 ff. As to Latin, cf. *Ramshorn*, S. 514 f. For the Hebrew, many examples (which, indeed, require sifting) are given by *Nolde*, Concordant. particul. p. 313 sqq.

As a distinct species of asyndeton that construction deserves notice, which, after a declaration, appends a discussion of it by repeating the substantive without *καί*, as in Jno. x. 11 *ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός· ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων*, xv. 13; 1 Cor. viii. 2. In such passages we need only supply in thought a *ὅτι* (*γάρ*) or *οὖν* (*ὥστε*), in order to feel how the expression would thus be weakened, cf. Lys. in Nicomach. 23; Aesch. Ctesiph. 48 (Kritz, Sallust. I. 184). Lastly, the amplification of a thought is not unfrequently introduced asyndetically, as in Heb. xi. 3. 502 7th ed.

Clauses appended *ἀσυνδέτως*, the expositors, in accordance with a prevalent impropriety, are fond of bringing into connection with what precedes by the insertion of particles, and thus the rhetorical effect of the omission of the conjunction is entirely overlooked, e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 17; vii. 23; Jas. v. 3, see Pott in loc. With similar impropriety the copyists have often inserted a connective.

3. Sentences are connected with each other most simply by the copulative particles *καί* and *τε* (negatively by *οὐδέ*), which denote nothing beyond mere annexation (see § 53). Hence in historical style, according to Oriental simplicity, the transition from one fact to another is often made by them, — by *καί* in the Gospels and the Acts, *τε* (Mdv. S. 212) being used almost exclusively in Acts; cf. *καί* Matt. iv. 23–25; vii. 25; viii. 23–25; ix. 1–4; xiii. 53–58; Mark i. 13; ii. 1 f.; Jno. ii. 7 f. 13–16; iii. 22; iv. 27; v. 9; Acts ii. 1–4; xii. 7–9, 24–26; *τε* Acts xii. 6, 12, 17; xiii. 4, 46, 50, 52; xiv. 11–13, 21; xv. 4, 6; xvi. 23, 34; xvii. 26; xviii. 4, 26; xix. 2 f. 6, 11; xx. 3, 7; xxv. 2; xxvii. 3, 8, 29; xxviii. 2.[1] In particular, after a specification of time in an independent clause the event is annexed by *καί*, as in Mark xv. 25 *ἦν ὥρα τρίτη καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν*, Jno. xi. 55 *ἦν ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα καὶ ἀνέβησαν πολλοί*, iv. 35 etc. (cf. § 53, 3). With the Greeks this became an established form when the specification of time was to be made prominent, see Mdv. 213 f. 477 6th ed.

Narration is continued, however, still more regularly by means of the well-defined connecting particles *δέ* and *οὖν* (see § 53). These, since the first adds something other, different, new, and the second indicates the sequence, are in a loose application peculiarly adapted to the historical style. Hence the N. T. writers, by an 562

[1] What *Rost*, S. 723 f., says of this *τε* connecting clauses in Attic prose scarcely finds corroboration in Luke.

interchange of καί, δέ, οὖν, imparted to their narration a certain variety, which even in the Gospels veiled the Hebraistic complexion. Cf. Jno. ii. 1 (καί twice); 2 (δέ); 3 (καί); 8 (καί), 8 f. (δέ); iv. 4 (δέ); 5 (οὖν); 6 (δέ and οὖν); 39 (δέ); 40 (οὖν); 41 (καί); 42 (τε); Acts xii. 1–3 (δέ four times); 5 (οὖν and δέ); 6 (δέ); 7 (καί twice and δέ); 8 (δέ twice and καί); 9 (καί twice and δέ); 10 (καί twice and δέ); 11 (καί); 12 (τε); 13 (δέ); 14 (καί and δέ); 15 (δέ three times); 16 (δέ twice); 17 (δέ, τε, and καί); 18 (δέ); 19 (δέ and καί); 20 (δέ twice); 21, 22 (δέ); 23 (δέ and καί); 24 f. (δέ); xxv. 1 (οὖν); 2 (τε); 4, 5 (οὖν); 6, 7 (δέ), etc.

Not much more characteristic, yet aiming at greater diversity, is the
503 connection, in the historical style, effected by τότε (especially in Matt.),
7th ed. μετὰ τοῦτο or ταῦτα (especially in John and Luke), ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις etc. (in isolated cases εἶτα).

The *polysyndeton* between clauses not purely narrative is designed to give them prominence as individual portions of a compound sentence, e.g. Jno. x. 3 τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ' ὄνομα καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά vss. 9, 12; cf. Acts xiii. 36; xvii. 28; 1 Cor. xii. 4 ff.

4. The connection of sentences is more close when it is based on a contrast: either in general, when two sentences are joined together, like an arsis and thesis, by μέν ... δέ (Mdv. 215) or καί ... καί (Mdv. 212), negatively by οὔτε ... οὔτε, as Acts xxii. 9 τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθεάσαντο, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν, xxiii. 8; xxv. 11; i. 5 (cf. § 53, 7); Mark ix. 13 καὶ Ἠλίας ἐλήλυθεν καὶ ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ ὅσα ἤθελον, Jno. ix. 37 see § 53, 4; or when an affirmative sentence is opposed to a negative, or vice versa, as Jno. iii. 17 οὐκ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα
478 σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος, Rom. ix. 1 ἀλήθειαν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ, οὐ ψεύδομαι,
6th ed. cf. § 55, 8.

To this form of expression (antithesis) are likewise to be referred,

a. Comparative sentences, as Matt. xii. 40 ὥσπερ ἦν Ἰωνᾶς ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ τοῦ κήτους τρεῖς ἡμέρας κ. τρεῖς νύκτας, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ τ. γῆς, Matt. v. 48 ἔσεσθε ὑμεῖς τέλειοι, ὡς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν τέλειός ἐστιν, Jno. iii. 14 καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὕψωσεν ... οὕτως ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ, Luke vi. 31 καθὼς θέλετε, ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ... καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.

563 b. Temporal sentences (see § 53, 8), as Luke i. 23 ὡς ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ... ἀπῆλθεν, Acts xxvii. 1; Jno. iv. 1; Matt. xvii. 25 ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ... προέφθασεν, vi. 2 ὅταν οὖν ποιῇς ἐλεημοσύνην, μὴ σαλπίσῃς ἔμπροσθέν σου, etc.

c. Even conditional sentences (§ 53, 8) 1 Cor. ix. 17 *εἰ ἑκὼν τοῦτο πράσσω, μισθὸν ἔχω*, Luke vii. 39 *εἰ ἦν προφήτης, ἐγίνωσκεν ἄν*, Jno. vii. 17 *ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται* etc. That these also are properly to be referred to this head, is apparent from the structure, elsewhere examined, that occurs in Jas. v. 13 *κακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν, προσευχέσθω*, where the conditional clause makes its appearance as independent: *some one among you is afflicted* (I suppose the case), *let him pray;* 1 Cor. vii. 21 *δοῦλος ἐκλήθης, μή σοι μελέτω*, cf. Jas. ii. 19 f.; Mdv. 224. Here *εἰ* has by some been unwarrantably supplied; and it is equally inadmissible to regard the first clause as interrogative, see above, p. 285; cf. Bhdy. 385; Dissen, Demosth. cor. p. 284 sq. So in Latin Terent. Eunuch. 2, 2, 21 negat quis, nego; ait, ajo. Heind. Horat. serm. 1, 1, 45; Kritz, Sall. II. 349.

5. In the cases just adduced a.–c. (as well as in causal sentences) a protasis and apodosis are contrasted (Luke i. 1; v. 4; Matt. iv. 3; v. 13; Heb. ii. 14, etc.), though the beginning of the latter is not in most cases specially marked, as it is in German by *so* — (hence sometimes it is doubtful where the apodosis begins, as in Jas. iii. 3 f.; iv. 15, etc.); for when *οὕτως* seems to be employed for this purpose, or when *εἶτα, τότε*, and in hypothetical constructions *ἀλλά, δέ* (Jacobs, Ael. anim. p. 27 sq. praef.), *ἄρα* (*οὖν*? see § 63), is put before the apodosis, as in Mark xiii. 14; Matt. xii. 28; Jno. vii. 10; xi. 6; xii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 23; xv. 54; xvi. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. v. 3, etc., it is intended to give prominence to the apodosis, — by *οὕτως* in particular to refer again to the circumstances expressed in the protasis. 504 7th ed.

It is only in comparative sentences that

a. A *οὕτως* or *καί* before the apodosis corresponds often to the *ὡς, ὥσπερ, καθώς* of the protasis, Rom. v. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 3; 1 Thess. ii. 7; Matt. xii. 40; Jno. v. 21; xv. 4, 9; xx. 21 (*οὕτως* is the most regular correlate of *ὥσπερ*). *Οὕτως* after a conditional clause was formerly thought to be purely pleonastic. But in Rev. xi. 5 *οὕτως* means hoc modo (see the sentence preceding), and in 1 Thess. iv. 14 it refers to the similarity of the lot of believers to that of Christ (*ἀπέθανε καὶ ἀνέστη*); and these instances have no resemblance to those adduced by Mtth. 1457. (Still less is *οὕτως* redundant after participles in Jno. iv. 6; Acts xx. 11; see § 65, 9.) In the case of grouping of protasis and apodosis, the protasis is usually repeated in a distinct form after the apodosis, so as to produce apparently a double apodosis, as in Rev. ii. 5 *μετανόησον* · 564 479 6th ed.

εἰ δὲ μὴ (μετανοεῖς), ἔρχομαί σοι ταχύ . . ., ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃς, where the length of the sentence occasioned the repetition. This, however, is probably not the case in Matt. v. 18, see § 65, 6, p. 612.

6. Objective, consecutive, final, and causal sentences are conceived as distinctly dependent on, and consequently subordinate to, a leading clause, and are accordingly presented in the form of dependent sentences introduced respectively by ὅτι, ὡς, by ὥστε, ὡς (not ἵνα, see § 53, 10, 6 p. 457 sq.) also οὖν, ἄρα, by ἵνα or ὅπως, by γάρ, ὅτι etc. see § 53 (where the relation of grammatical dependence is sometimes expressed also by the indirect moods of the verb). Causal are akin to objective sentences; hence both are introduced by ὅτι (*quod*), signifying either *because* or *that*. Εἰ (like the Latin si) is so used apparently in one class of cases, after verbs denoting an affection of the mind, where the objective ὅτι might have been expected (Hoogeveen, doctr. partic. ed. Schütz, p. 228 sq.; Jacob, Lucian. Toxar. p. 52; Mdv. 225), e.g. Mark xv. 44 ἐθαύμασεν εἰ ἤδη τέθνηκεν miratus est si jam mortuus fuerit, 1 Jno. iii. 13 μὴ θαυμάζετε, εἰ μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος cf. Fr. Marc. p. 702. But ὅτι is employed when the occasion of surprise (grief etc.) is a positive matter of fact, εἰ when it hovers before the speaker's mind as merely a possibility, seems to him doubtful, or at least is to be represented as doubtful: marvel not, *if* the world hate you (Weber, Demosth. p. 535; Mtth. 1474 f.; Rost 622). Similar is Acts xxvi. 8. Sometimes modesty or diffidence has led to the selection of this latter form of expression,
505 just as we sometimes hear: he begged him *if* he would not promise
7th ed. (Germ. er bat ihn, *ob* u.s.w.). Cf. with this Acts viii. 22.

The affinity of objective and relative sentences is illustrated in Acts xiv. 27 ἀνήγγελλον, ὅσα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ ὅτι ἤνοιξεν etc.

7. a. Relative sentences still more distinctly assume a dependent character when they are of an appositive nature, whether more or less requisite to complete the sentence; as, Matt. ii. 9 ὁ ἀστήρ, ὃν εἶδον, προῆγεν αὐτούς, Rom. v. 14 Ἀδάμ, ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος, 1 Cor. i. 30 Χριστῷ, ὃς ἐγενήθη σοφία ἡμῖν etc., Acts i. 2; xv. 10. But the form of a relative clause is adopted in two other cases: *a.* when the discourse, particularly a narration, is continued by ὅς and that is resolvable into καὶ οὗτος, as in Acts xiii. 43 ἠκολούθησαν πολλοί . . . τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Βαρνάβᾳ, οἵτινες προσλαλοῦντες ἔπειθον αὐτούς etc., Acts xvi. 24 ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν
565 παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι . . . ὃς παραγγελίαν τοιαύτην etc.,

Luke x. 30; Acts iii. 3; xiii. 31; xiv. 9; xvi. 14, 16; xvii. 10; xix. 25; xxi. 4; xxii. 4; xxiii. 14; xxviii. 23; β. when the Subject or Predicate is a relative sentence, e.g. Acts xiii. 25 ἔρχεται, οὗ 480
οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος τὸ ὑπόδημα λῦσαι, vs. 48 ἐπίστευσαν, ὅσοι ἦσαν τεταγ- 6th ed.
μένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, vs. 37; Jno. xi. 3 ὃν φιλεῖς, ἀσθενεῖ, Matt. x. 27; xxiii. 12; Jno. i. 46; iii. 34; xv. 7; 1 Jno. ii. 5; iv. 6; Acts xiii. 37; Rom. viii. 25. In this case the relative clause is often placed before the principal, as in Jno. iii. 34; xiii. 7; 1 Jno. iii. 17; Acts x. 15; Rom. viii. 25, or there is a reference from the latter to the relative clause by means of a demonstrative, as in Matt. v. 19; Luke ix. 26; Jno. v. 19; 1 Jno. ii. 5.

Not unfrequently several relative clauses are combined, as in 1 Pet. iii. 19–22, — either as co-ordinate, as in Acts xiv. 15 f.; i. 2 f.; iii. 2 f.; xxvii. 23; xxiv. 6, 8 (Tdf.), or as subordinate one to another, as in Acts xiii. 31 (Ἰησοῦς) ὃς ὤφθη τοῖς συναναβᾶσιν αὐτῷ ... οἵτινες νῦν εἰσὶν μάρτυρες αὐτοῦ etc. xxv. 15 f.; xxvi. 7; Rom. i. 2, 5, 6.

b. Indirect interrogative sentences (which in classic Greek were marked by the special form of the interrogatives ὅστις, ὁποῖος, ὁπόσος etc.), as Jno. vi. 64 ἤδει τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες, Matt. x. 11 ἐξετάσατε τίς ἄξιός ἐστιν, Jno. iii. 8 οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται κ. ποῦ ὑπάγει, Acts x. 18 ἐπυνθάνετο εἰ Σίμων ἐνθάδε ξενίζεται, Luke xxii. 23 ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν, Acts xxv. 20 ἀπορούμενος ἐγὼ ... ἔλεγον, εἰ βούλοιτο πορεύεσθαι etc. Cf. on this Schleiermacher, Hermen. S. 131.

8. We have thus far spoken of the connection of sentences with each other by certain single connective words, among which, speaking somewhat loosely, the relatives also may be reckoned; but connection may also be effected by means of forms of inflection, 506
especially the Infinitive and the Participle, in such a manner as to 7th ed.
render grammatically the subordinate clauses constituent parts of the principal clause:

a. 1 Cor. xvi. 3 τούτους πέμψω ἀπενεγκεῖν τὴν χάριν (ἵνα ἀπενέγκωσι), Mark iv. 3 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι, Acts xxvi. 16 εἰς τοῦτο ὤφθην σοι, προχειρίσασθαί σε, Phil. i. 7 διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμᾶς (ὅτι ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ κ. ἔχω), Acts xviii. 2; xxvii. 9; xix. 1 ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ τὸν Ἀπολλὼ εἶναι ἐν Κορίνθῳ, xx. 1 μετὰ τὸ παύσασθαι τὸν θόρυβον ... ὁ Παῦλος ἐξῆλθεν. Especially do Infinitives with prepositions serve to give compactness and roundness to sentences, and so too the Acc. with the Inf. which

usually represents an objective clause; as, Heb. vi. 11 *ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐνδείκνυσθαι σπουδήν*, 1 Tim. ii. 8 *βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι ἄνδρας* etc. § 44, 3, p. 321.

566 b. 2 Cor. vii. 1 *ταύτας ἔχοντες ἐπαγγελίας καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτούς*, Luke iv. 35; Acts xxv. 13 *κατήντησαν ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*, Acts xxv. 1 *Φῆστος ἐπιβὰς τῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ . . . ἀνέβη*, Luke iv. 2 *ἤγετο ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ πειραζόμενος*, Acts xii. 16 *ἐπέμενε κρούων* (§ 45, 4). Particularly are participles in the Gen. abs. employed thus to denote accessory circumstances, local or temporal (§ 30 note, p. 207), e.g. Acts xxv. 13 *ἡμερῶν διαγενομένων τινῶν Ἀγρίππας καὶ Βερνίκη κατήντησαν*, x. 9 *ἐκείνων τῇ πόλει ἐγγιζόντων ἀνέβη Πέτρος*, Luke iv. 40 *δύνοντος τοῦ ἡλίου πάντες . . . ἤγαγον*, ix. 42 *ἔτι προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον*, Mark xiv. 3 *καὶ*
481 *ὄντος αὐτοῦ ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ, κατακειμένου*
5th ed. *αὐτοῦ, ἦλθεν γυνή* etc. And this gradually became so usual a mode of expression, that it was employed even when the subject was the same as that of the principal clause, see p. 208. Besides, one and the same principal sentence frequently contains several participial constructions co-ordinate or subordinate one to another, by which means the structure of the sentence is rendered more organic, e.g. Acts xii. 25 *Βαρνάβας καὶ Σαῦλος ὑπέστρεψαν ἐξ Ἰερουσαλήμ, πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν, συμπαραλαβόντες καὶ Ἰωάννην*, xvi. 27 *ἔξυπνος γενόμενος ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ καὶ ἰδὼν ἀνεῳγμένας τὰς θύρας τῆς φυλακῆς, σπασάμενος μάχαιραν ἤμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν, νομίζων ἐκπεφευγέναι τοὺς δεσμίους*, xxiii. 27 *τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον συλλημφθέντα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ μέλλοντα ἀναιρεῖσθαι ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἐπιστὰς σὺν τῷ στρατεύματι ἐξειλάμην αὐτόν, μαθών* etc. Acts xiv. 19; xviii. 22 f.; xxv. 6 f.; 2 Tim. i. 4; Tit. ii. 13; 1 Cor. xi. 4; Luke vii. 37 f.

Hence in general it must be noticed, that in this manner compound sentences receive not merely greater variety, but also a greater degree of periodic compactness. This latter result is effected still more decidedly by the blending of two independent propositions into one, *Attraction* (§ 66), for which purpose relatives possess very extensive aptitude (§ 24). Attraction, too, is itself very diversified, and occurs even in the N. T. in many forms, from
507 the simple (as in Luke v. 9 *ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων, ἧς συνέλαβον*,
7th ed. Acts iv. 13 *ἐπεγίνωσκον αὐτοὺς ὅτι σὺν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἦσαν*) to the complex, as in Rom. iii. 8 *τί ἔτι κἀγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; καὶ μή, καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθώς φασίν τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀγαθά;*

Note. In contrast with this intertwining of clauses stands the practice of forming a proposition where a simple Infinitive would have sufficed; as, Mark xiv. 21 *καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος*, 1 Jno. v. 2 *ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν, ὅτι . . ., ὅταν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπῶμεν* (ii. 3), Acts xxvii. 42 *τῶν στρατιωτῶν βουλὴ ἐγένετο, ἵνα τοὺς δεσμώτας ἀποκτείνωσιν* (on the other 567 .
hand, vs. 12), Rev. xix. 8. This mode of expression is not always adopted from a love of amplification (a peculiarity of the later language), but is employed sometimes to give more forcible prominence, and sometimes to attain a more flexible construction.

9. By these various means of connection, the style of the N. T. is shaped into an organic structure which is by no means destitute of variety, though it is inferior in this respect to the style of Greek authors. In this way are constructed periods even of considerable length, particularly in Luke (and especially in the Acts), e.g. Luke i. 1–3; Acts xii. 13 f.; xv. 24–26; xvii. 24 f.; xx. 9, 20 f.; xxiii. 10; xxvi. 10–14, 16–18; Rom. i. 1–7; 1 Pet. iii. 18–22; Heb. ii. 2–4; 2 Pet. i. 2–7. At the same time it must be admitted that, after the beginning of a long period has been made, the thread of the arrangement is frequently broken, and the sentence terminates in some kind of anacoluthon or remains quite unfinished Rom. iii. 8; xii. 6–8; xvi. 25 f. 27; Mark vi. 8 f.; Gal. ii. 4 f.; 2 Pet. ii. 4–8; 2 Thess. ii. 3 f.; see § 63, or at least is commenced anew 2 Pet. ii. 5 sq.; Eph. v. 27; Jno. viii. 53; Rev. ii. 2, 9. The N. T. writers, 482
further, have desisted from one mode of constructing ramified 6th ed.
sentences, in that they regularly do not incorporate quotations, though but of small extent, in an indirect form, but express them directly, and without introducing them always by *ὅτι* as an external connective or by *λέγων*, as in Matt. ix. 18; xxvi. 72; Mark xi. 32; Luke v. 12; Jno. i. 20; xxi. 17; Gal. i. 23; Acts iii. 22; v. 23, etc. They often, even when they begin with an indirect quotation of others' words, pass over very soon into the oratio directa, as in Luke v. 14; Acts i. 4; xxiii. 22; see § 63. The same takes place in particular after verbs of requesting; in which case instead of subjoining the request indirectly, by means of an Inf. or a clause with *ἵνα* (§ 44, 8), the precise words of the petitioner are stated, as in Luke xiv. 18 *ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρῃτημένον*, vs. 19; v. 12; Jno. iv. 31; ix. 2; Phil. iv. 3; Acts ii. 40; xvi. 15; xxi. 39; Matt. viii. 31; xviii. 29; 1 Cor. iv. 16. However, what the style loses thus in compactness, it gains on the other hand in animation and vividness. Further, see Schleiermacher, Herm. 131.

Note. It is interesting to notice, in parallel sections, especially in the

first three gospels, the variety as respects the structure and connection of
508 sentences. Luke will be found by such comparison invariably the most
7th ed. expert writer, and more careful than the others also in the selection of his words; (he prefers, for instance, idiomatic expressions, verba composita and decomposita). This subject, however, belongs to N. T. *Stylistics*.

568 § 61. POSITION OF WORDS AND CLAUSES, ESPECIALLY WHEN IRREGULAR (HYPERBATON).

1. The arrangement of the individual words of a sentence is, in general, determined by the order in which the conceptions are formed, and by the specific relation which the different parts of the sentence (as groups of words) bear to each other. This relation requires, for instance, that the adjective should regularly be placed in immediate contact with its substantive, the adverb with its verb or adjective, the Genitive with its governing noun, the preposition with its case, and one member of an antithesis with the other. In particulars, however, the connection of a clause with what precedes (cf. Heb. xi. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 6; Col. ii. 9; Phil. iv. 10), the greater (rhetorical) emphasis to be given to a word, even to a greater or less degree the requirements of euphony, regulate the respective position of the words. Sometimes, however, the arrangement depends on the nature or the conventional importance of the ideas (e.g. *terra marique*, etc.). It is not necessary that the word to be emphasized should be placed at the commencement of the clause; it may even stand at the end (see e.g. Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 74), and in any case in that position which from the nature of the sentence gives it the most striking prominence. For example, intentional connection with what pre-
483 cedes causes a relative pronoun, even in an oblique case, usually
6th ed. to begin the clause etc. The position of words is determined therefore, by the laws of the succession of thought and by rhetorical aims (Hm. Soph. Trach. p. 131). And although these leave great latitude to the spontaneous mental movements of the writer, and are never felt by the practised author as trammels; yet just because the arrangement of words decidedly serves logical and rhetorical purposes, only a small part of it usually becomes so habitual with an individual writer that it can be considered as a prominent characteristic of his style.[1]

[1] No very thorough treatise is known to me on the arrangement of words in Greek. *Kühner's* attempt, however, to vindicate for this subject (under the name of *Topik*) its

2. The arrangement of words in the N. T. is in the main deter- 509
mined by the same principles as in the Greek prose authors, for 7th ed. 569
these principles are but to a very small extent confined to any particular nation. It must be remarked, however, that

a. The arrangement of words is bolder and more diversified in the didactic writings, particularly those of Paul, than in the historical books; since in the former the rhetorical element is more influential, while in the (synoptical) gospels the Hebraistic type of arrangement predominates.

b. Especially in the narrative style, a wide separation of the two principal parts of a sentence, the Subject and the verb (Predicate), is avoided; and, in accordance with the Hebrew mode of expression, sometimes the verb is advanced nearer to the Subject, sometimes, when the Subject is complex, only the principal Subject precedes the verb, and the others follow (see § 58, 6), lest the attention should be kept too long in suspense. Relative clauses, too, are if possible so placed as to be introduced only after the full enunciation of the principal clause. On the whole, the arrangement of words in the N. T. is simple and free from all affectation, as well as from stiffness or monotony. Gersdorf, in his well-known work, has professed to point out numerous peculiarities of individual N. T. writers; but on strict examination it will be found that a) he has not duly investigated the several particulars on which the arrangement of words is in every case dependent; and b) under the impression that it might become the invariable usage of a writer to place e.g. the adverb *before* or *after* the verb, he has propounded and partly executed a species of critical inquiry that merits the charge of prejudgment. A philosophical work on this 484
subject would be a great acquisition to verbal criticism. 6th ed.

It is not a matter of indifference whether a writer employs τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ or τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. § 20, 1), or, without the articles, πνεῦμα θεοῦ or θεοῦ πν. Every individual passage of the N. T. must be elucidated according to its respective stylistic conformation. To lose sight

due place in grammar deserves thanks (ii. 622 ff.); *Mdv.* also has collected some observations on the subject (Syntax, S. 258 ff.). In regard to Latin, special inquiries were previously instituted in connection with the doctrine of sound, and the subject is ably though briefly handled by *Zumpt*, Grammat. S. 626 ff.; cf. also *Hand*, Lehrb. des lat. Styls S. 307 ff.; *Gernhard*, commentatt. gramm. P. 8 (Jen. 1828. 4to.). On the ancient languages in general, see *H. Weil*, de l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes etc. Paris, 1844. 8vo. As respects the habitude of individual writers in the arrangement of words, *Tzschirner*, for instance, who strove after a prose rhythm, could not fail to be recognized in any one of his writings.

of this, neglecting the Codd. (as well as the ancient versions, and the more or less free quotations in the Fathers), and invariably to attribute to a writer one and the same arrangement of words, is empirical pedantry. If the adjective is *usually* placed thus: φόβος μέγας, ἔργον ἀγαθόν, or the
570 adverb in reference to its adjective thus: χαλεπὸς λίαν, μεγάλη σφόδρα
510 (Strabo 17, 801), the arrangement is very natural. The opposite arrange-
7th ed ment either aims at giving prominence to the adjectival or adverbial notion, which with many writers may be caused by an antithesis habitual to them (καλὰ ἔργα is used for the most part by Paul); or the (antithetical) nature of a particular adjectival notion may require that it should precede, like ἄλλος, εἷς, ἴδιος, etc. That ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος should occur more frequently than οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος is likewise not surprising. The latter arrangement implies an emphasis on the pronoun (*this* man, no other), which is in place only when one is speaking δεικτικῶς or intensively. The predominance of the latter arrangement in John (Gersdorf 444 f.) is, in the first place, by no means decided, and secondly, the reason for such arrangement may be easily perceived in all the passages in which it occurs. Ταῦτα πάντα Luke xii. 30 and πάντα ταῦτα Matt. vi. 32 are not exactly of the same import (Gersd. 447 f.): the former means THESE THINGS *all together*; the latter, ALL *these*. In the first expression, πάντα is a closer specification of ταῦτα; in the second, πάντα is pointed out demonstratively by means of ταῦτα. Πάντα ταῦτα is undoubtedly the more rare, much like *omnia haec* in Latin, yet in Matt. xxiii. 36; xxiv. 33 f.; Luke vii. 18 it is the better established reading, cf. Bengel on Matt. xxiv. 33. That the narrators when they subjoin something chronologically say ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις and the like, will not be considered by any observant reader as an arbitrary deviation from the usual sequence: ἡ πόλις ἐκείνη. To what purpose are remarks such as: πάλιν, ἐκεῖθεν etc. are placed sometimes before and sometimes after?[1] Finally, I cannot imagine how Gersdorf (S. 335) could so misjudge the place of the adjective in Matt. xiii. 27; xv. 20 as even to be inclined to correct the text. When we find in Matt. xv. 34 πόσους ἄρτους ἔχετε; οἱ δὲ εἶπον· ἑπτὰ καὶ ὀλίγα ἰχθύδια but in Mark viii. 7 καὶ εἶχον ἰχθύδια ὀλίγα, the antithesis with ἑπτὰ required that ὀλίγα should precede; whilst in the latter passage *bread* and *fish* are contrasted: they had also in *fish* a small provision. That Paul writes in 1 Tim. v. 23 οἴνῳ ὀλίγῳ and James iii. 5 ὀλίγον (var. ἡλίκον) πῦρ, nobody probably will think strange who studies language with attention. In Jno. v. 22 τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ υἱῷ, πᾶσαν is very appropriately
485 placed immediately before δέδωκε, as it belongs to it (he gave it to him not
6th ed. in part, but wholly, 1 Cor. xii. 12), cf. also Matt. ix. 35; Rom. iii. 9; xii. 4;

[1] Even the more precise remark of *van Hengel*, Philipp. p. 201, on πάλιν as used in Paul's epistles, I cannot admit as a canon according to which critical or exegetical inquiries could implicitly be conducted. As to Phil. ii. 28 I adhere to the exposition propounded in § 45, 4 note 1 p. 346.

Acts xvi. 26; xvii. 21; 1 Cor. x. 1 (Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 40; Thuc. 7, 60 etc.). Along with the arrangement πᾶσα ἡ πόλις occurs also ὁ πᾶς νόμος Gal. v. 14, τὸν πάντα χρόνον Acts xx. 18; 1 Tim. i. 16 (Thuc. 4, 61; Isocr. Dem. 571
p. 1; Herod. 1, 14, 10; Stallb. Phil. 48). On the simple *precedence* of an emphatic word (Jno. vi. 57; viii. 25; ix. 31; xiii. 6; Rom. vii. 23; xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xii. 22; xiv. 2; xv. 44; Luke ix. 20; xii. 30; xvi. 11; Heb. x. 30; Jas. iii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Pet. i. 21), no remark is necessary. Yet see under 3. The order in the apostolic benediction χάρις 511
ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη, uniformly adhered to as it is (in 1st and 2d Pet. also), is 7th ed.
certainly intended to point out χάρις as the principal and more comprehensive idea, to which εἰρήνη is added as a consequent. The Vocative, with or without ὦ, either precedes the sentence, — that is, when it expresses a cry Mark xiv. 37, or as an address is intended to rouse the attention for what follows Matt. viii. 2; xv. 28; xviii. 32; xxv. 26; Mark ix. 19; Luke viii. 48; xxiv. 25; Jno. vi. 68; xiii. 6; xxi. 15 sqq.; Acts i. 11; ii. 29; v. 35; vii. 59; ix. 13; xiii. 10; xxv. 24; Rom. ix. 20; Gal. iii. 1; 1 Tim. vi. 20, — or is intercalated into the sentence, when, that is, the attention of the person addressed is assumed, and what follows is to be referred solely to him Matt. ix. 22; xvi. 17; xx. 31; Jno. xii. 15; Acts i. 1; xxvi. 19, 24, 27; Gal. i. 11; Phil. i. 12; iii. 17; Philem. 20; 2 Pet. i. 10; Rev. xv. 4. The Vocative in this case stands after one word or several, according as they are or are not connected in sense Matt. xvi. 17; Jno. xii. 15; Rev. xv. 4, etc.; sometimes, when supplementary, it stands at the end of the sentence Luke v. 8; Jno. xiv. 9; Acts xxvi. 7.

3. The grounds of every unusual arrangement (transposition) of words, when it originates in the writer's free choice, may with greater or less distinctness be ascertained. The following cases are to be distinguished:

a. When the unusual position of the words is occasioned by *rhetorical* causes, and is consequently intentional, as in 1 Pet. ii. 7 the appositive (Weber, Demosth. p. 152) τοῖς πιστεύουσιν is reserved for the conclusion, because the condition *as believers, if we believe*, thus obtains greater prominence, particularly as it is brought so close to the antithetical ἀπειθοῦσι.[1] Cf. 1 Jno. v. 13, 16; Jno. xiii. 14; Rom. xi. 13; Heb. vi. 18 (Stallb. Plat. Euthyd. p. 144), also Heb. vii. 4 ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν ἀκροθινίων, ὁ πατριάρχης *unto whom Abr. gave even a tenth, the patriarch*, xi. 17; 1 Pet. iv. 4. Other instances of the same sort are Heb. vi. 19 ἣν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τ. ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν καὶ εἰσερχομένην etc. x. 34; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσ-

[1] Cf. with this Demosth. fals. leg. 204 c. εἰμὶ τοίνυν ὁ κατηγορῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐγὼ τούτων, τούτων δ' οὐδεὶς ἐμοῦ.

σαις τ. ἀνθρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, Acts xxiv. 17; xxvi. 22. The Genitive in particular is put last, 1 Thess. i. 6; Jno. vii. 38; 1 Tim. iii. 6, etc. In giving a word *precedence* (see above, no. 2), antithesis is manifest in 1 Cor. x. 11 ταῦτα τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρός etc. Luke xvi. 12; xxiii. 31; Jno. ix. 17; xxi. 21, likewise in 2 Cor. ii. 4 οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀγάπην ἵνα γνῶτε, xii. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 15; Acts xix. 4; Rom. xi. 31; Col. iv. 16; Gal. ii. 10 (Cic. div. 1, 40; Mil. 2 fin.; Krü. 236), as well as in 1 Cor. vi. 4 βιωτικὰ μὲν οὖν κριτήρια ἐὰν ἔχητε (such postponement of ἐάν is frequent in Demosth., see Klotz, Devar. p. 484); Rom. xii. 3 ἑκάστῳ ὡς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως, 1 Cor. iii. 5; viii. 7;
512 Jno. xiii. 34 (Cic. off. 2, 21, 72); 2 Thess. ii. 7 μόνον ὁ κατέχων
7th ed. ἄρτι ἕως ἐκ μέσου γένηται, finally in Rom. viii. 18 οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τ. νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τ. μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι, Gal. iii. 23; Heb. x. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 22.

b. At other times we find a closer specification, which only occurred to the writer after the sentence had been arranged,
572 brought in afterwards; as, Acts xxii. 9 τὸ μὲν φῶς ἐθεάσαντο, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλοῦντός μοι, iv. 33 μεγάλῃ δυνάμει ἀπεδίδουν τὸ μαρτύριον οἱ ἀπόστολοι τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, Heb. xii. 11; Jno. iv. 39; vi. 66; xii. 11; 1 Cor.
486 x. 27; Luke xix. 47; 1 Pet. i. 13; 2 Pet. iii. 2 (Acts xix. 27);
6th ed. cf. Arrian. Al. 3, 23, 1 τοὺς ὑπολειφθέντας ἐν τῇ διώξει τῆς στρατιᾶς. To this head should probably be referred also Rev. vii. 17. In 2 Pet. iii. 1 ἐν αἷς διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ὑπομνήσει τὴν εἰλικρινῆ διάνοιαν the words spaced out are thrust into the current of the sentence as a subjoined closer specification of διεγείρω.

c. Words which are to be joined together in sense, are placed near each other; as, Rom. ix. 21 ἔχει ἐξουσίαν ὁ κεραμεὺς τ. πηλοῦ ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ φυράματος ποιῆσαι etc., 1 Pet. ii. 16; 1 Cor. ii. 11. In Eph. ii. 3 φύσει belongs to τέκνα, and accordingly has the most suitable place.

d. Sometimes the transposition is unavoidable; as, Heb. xi. 32 ἐπιλείψει γάρ με διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σαμψών etc. where, since a long series of names follows with which in vs. 33 a relative clause is to be connected, no other arrangement was possible, vi. 1, 2; 1 Cor. i. 30.

e. An effort to keep unimportant words in the background, is manifest in Heb. iv. 11 ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ὑποδείγματι πέσῃ etc. v. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 19; Acts xxvi. 24. So perhaps in 1 Cor. v. 1 ὥστε γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν (*that the wife one has of his*

father), Luke xviii. 18. See Weber, Demosth. pp. 139, 251. Likewise in Heb. ix. 16 ὅπου διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου, the main thought θάνατον ἀνάγκη would have been weakened if the last word had been placed anywhere else. Occasionally in the more dexterous N. T. writers the *aurium judicium* even, on which Cicero laid so much stress, may have exerted an influence, and produced a more flowing and rhythmical arrrangement.

On the collocation of the same or similar words, as κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει, see § 68, 1; cf. Kühner II. 628.

The antecedent position of the Predicate (e.g. in Jno. i. 1, 49 cf. vs. 47; iv. 19, 24; vi. 60; Rom. xiii. 11; 2 Pet. i. 10, 14, 19; Phil. iii. 20; ii. 11; 1 Jno. i. 10; Rev. ii. 9) is everywhere to be judged of according to the principles stated above. It is quite natural also, that, particularly in sentences having an exclamatory character, as well as in macarisms, the predicate should be placed at the beginning (the omission of the substantive verb being in such sentences the predominant usage), e.g. Matt. xxi. 9 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου, xxiii. 39; Luke i. 42, 68; 2 Cor. i. 3; 1 Cor. ii. 11 [?]; 1 Pet. i. 3; Matt. v. 3 μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι, 4–11; xxiv. 46. So also regularly in forms of praise in the O. T. (בָּרוּךְ, מְבֹרָךְ) Gen. ix. 26; 1 Sam. xxvi. 25; 2 Sam. xviii. 28; Ps. cvi. 48, etc. But only an empirical expositor could regard this position as an unalterable rule; for, when the subject constitutes the principal notion, especially when it is antithetical to another subject, the predicate may and must be placed after it, cf. Ps. lxvii. 20 Sept. And so in Rom. ix. 5, if the words ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων θεὸς εὐλογητός etc. are referred to God, the position of the words is quite appropriate, and even indispensable, — which, with many others, Harless on Eph. i. 3 has failed to see. 513 7th ed. 573

As to placing in particular the Genitive before the governing noun, see § 30, 3, note 4, p. 192. Careful writers avoid such arrangement if misapprehension could arise from it. Hence in Heb. vi. 2 βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς is not instead of διδαχ. βαπτ., especially as in the other groups the position of the Genitive is in accordance with the rule. In the passages adduced by Tholuck from Thuc. and Plut. ambiguity is impossible.

4. Formerly, attention to the arrangement of words in the N. T. was restricted to those cases in which parts of sentences are found separated from those words with which they belong logically (1 Thess. ii. 13; 1 Pet. ii. 7; Rom. xi. 13; Heb. ii. 9), which was denominated *Trajection.*[1] Such restriction was not so much 487 6th ed.

[1] See on such trajections in Greek, *Abresch*, Aristaenet. p. 218; *Wolf*, Demosth. Lept. p. 300; *Reitz*, Lucian. VII. 448 Bip.; *Krüger*, Dion. Hal. p. 139, 318; *Engelhardt*, Euthyphr. p. 123 sq.

to be censured, as the almost entire neglect to inquire into the reasons which, in each particular case, gave occasion to the so called trajection. By such (rather instinctive) reasons the N. T. writers were invariably guided. Very seldom indeed have they transposed words, either when the nature of the ideas (Quintil. instit. 9, 4, 24) suggested the arrangement of the words (Matt. vii. 7; Jno. vii. 34; Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 13; Matt. viii. 11; Heb. xiii. 8), or in phrases where according to the nature or importance of the ideas (sometimes not without regard to ease of utterance) the order of words had been fixed conventionally. Thus: *ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες* Acts viii. 3; ix. 2, *γυναῖκες καὶ παιδία* or *τέκνα* Matt. xiv. 21; xv. 38; Acts xxi. 5, *ζῶντες κ. νεκροί* Acts x. 42; 2 Tim. iv. 1; 1 Pet. iv. 5, *νύκτα κ. ἡμέραν* Acts xx. 31; xxvi. 7, *νυκτὸς κ. ἡμέρας* 1 Thess. ii. 9; iii. 10, *σάρξ κ. αἷμα* Matt. xvi. 17; Gal. i. 16; Jno. vi. 54, 56, *ἐσθίειν (τρώγειν) κ. πίνειν* Matt. xi. 18; Luke vii. 34; xii. 45; 1 Cor. xi. 22, 29, *βρῶσις κ. πόσις* Rom. xiv. 17;
574 Col. ii. 16, *ἔργῳ κ. λόγῳ* Luke xxiv. 19 (Fr. Rom. III. 268), *ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ* Matt. v. 18; xi. 25; xxiv. 35; Acts iv. 24, etc. *ὁ ἥλιος κ. ἡ σελήνη* Luke xxi. 25; Rev. xxi. 23, *ἡ γῆ κ. ἡ θάλασσα* Acts iv. 24; xiv. 15; Rev. vii. 1, 3; xiv. 7, etc., *right ... left* Matt.
514 xx. 21; xxv. 33; Mark x. 40; Luke xxiii. 33; 2 Cor. vi. 7; Rev.
7th ed. x. 2, *δοῦλοι ... ἐλεύθεροι* 1 Cor. xii. 13; Gal. iii. 28; Eph. vi. 8, *Ἰουδαῖοι κ. Ἕλληνες* Acts xviii. 4; xix. 10; Rom. iii. 9; 1 Cor. i. 24 (cf. Rom. ii. 9 f.) and the like. Deviations from this order occur but sparingly (cases, indeed, may be conceived in which the reverse order corresponds better with the truth, cf. Rom. xiv. 9; Heusinger, Plut. educ. 2, 5); and if there is exclusive or predominant MS. authority for the opposite, it must be unhesitatingly adhered to, e.g. Eph. vi. 12 *αἷμα κ. σάρξ*, Heb. ii. 14; Matt. xxiii. 15 *ἡ θάλασσα κ. ἡ ξηρά*, Acts ix. 24 *ἡμέρας κ. νυκτός* Luke xviii. 7; Rom. xv. 18 *λόγῳ κ. ἔργῳ* (Diod. S. exc. Vat. p. 23), Col. iii. 11 *Ἕλλην κ. Ἰουδαῖος*. (Cod. D has in Matt. xiv. 21; xv. 38 [and in the latter passage Cod. Sin. also] *παιδία καὶ γυναῖκες*, cf. Caes. b. gall. 2, 28; 4, 14.) In the N. T. the order *οἱ πόδες καὶ αἱ χεῖρες* seems to predominate, as in Matt. xxii. 13; Jno. xi. 44; xiii. 9; Acts xxi. 11. Only in Luke xxiv. 39 f. we find the opposite *τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας* (perhaps with reference to the fact that only the hands of persons crucified were pierced, and were therefore considered principal parts, just as Jno. mentions only the hands). In Rom. xiv. 9 the order *νεκροὶ καὶ ζῶντες* is determined by the preceding *ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν*.

The arrangement of words in the N. T. is more unrestrained, when a series of ideas is framed. For then general and special conceptions etc. are not grouped together, but the words follow one another according to some loose association of ideas, or even a resemblance in sound, Rom. i. 29, 31; Col. iii. 5. See, in general, Lob. paralip. p. 62 sqq. 488 6th ed.

It is necessary to be cautious in applying to such abnormal arrangements the name of *hysteron proteron* (cf. Odyss. 12, 134 τὰς μὲν ἄρα θρέψασα τεκοῦσά τε, Thuc. 8, 66; Nitzsch on the Odyss. I. 251 f.). We remark in passing, that on Jno. i. 52 ἀγγέλους θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας Lücke has stated the right view of the matter; and that vi. 69 πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν (cf. x. 38) must not on account of 1 Jno. iv. 16 ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ πεπιστεύκαμεν (Jno. xvii. 8) be considered as an inversion of thought, see BCrus. in loc. Likewise, in other passages of the N. T. it would be a mistake to suppose there is a hysteron proteron: In 1 Tim. ii. 4 πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν the comprehensive ultimate end is first mentioned, and then the immediate (as the means of attaining the former), — (καί *and therefore*). In Acts xiv. 10, however, ἥλατο καὶ περιεπάτει is quite as possible as a matter of fact, as in iii. 8 περιπατῶν καὶ ἁλλόμενος. In 2 Pet. i. 9 μυωπάζων is subjoined as a more exact definition. The hysteron proteron which Bornem. Acts xvi. 18 has adopted from Cod. D, rests on too little authority. Further, see Wilke, Rhetor. 226. 575

5. f. Sometimes, however, single words were misplaced through inadvertency, or still more, because the ancients, expecting none but intelligent readers, were released from the necessity of minute accuracy. Such irregularity occurred not unfrequently in prose writers in the use of certain adverbs (Stallb. Plat. Phaed. p. 123), to which, from the sense, every reader could at once assign the proper position, even though the author's arrangement might not be the most logical. This applies to ἀεί in Isocr. Paneg. 14 διετέλεσαν κοινὴν τὴν πόλιν παρέχοντες καὶ τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις ἀεὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐπαμύνουσαν, Xen. Oec. 19, 19; Thuc. 2, 43, etc. (see Krüger, Dion. p. 252; Schaef. Demosth. II. 234); also to πολλάκις Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 93; to ἔτι Rom. v. 6 ἔτι Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν (instead of ἔτι ὄντ. ἡμ. ἀσθ.) cf. vs. 8; Plato, rep. 2, 363 d.; Achill. Tat. 5, 18 and Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 300 sqq.; lastly, to ὅμως 1 Cor. xiv. 7 ὅμως τὰ ἄψυχα φωνὴν διδόντα . . . ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δῷ, πῶς γνωσθήσεται τὸ αὐλούμενον etc. instead of τὰ ἄψυχα, (καίπερ) φων. διδ., ὅμως, ἐὰν μή etc., and Gal. iii. 15 ὅμως ἀνθρώπου κεκυρωμένην διαθήκην οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ instead of ὅμ. οὐδεὶς ἀθετεῖ (see Bengel, and my Comment. in loc.), cf. Plato, Phaed. 515 7th ed.

91 c. *φοβεῖται μὴ ἡ ψυχὴ ὅμως καὶ θειότερον καὶ κάλλιον ὂν τοῦ σώματος προαπολλύηται*, see Hm. and Lob. Soph. Aj. 15; Doederlein, Soph. Oed. C. p. 396; Pflugk, Eurip. Androm. p. 10 and Hel. p. 76.[1]

489 6th ed. Likewise the transposition of a negative is not altogether rare in Greek authors (especially the poets, see Hm. Eurip. Hec. vs. 12). Then, however, there is either a suppressed antithesis, e.g. Plat. Crit. 47 d. *πειθόμενοι μὴ τῇ τῶν ἐπαϊόντων δόξῃ*, legg. 12, 943 a.; Xen. M. 3, 9, 6; cf. Kühner II. 628;[2] or the negative, instead of

576 being joined to the word denied, is prefixed to the whole sentence, as in Plato, Apol. 35 d. *ἃ μήτε ἡγοῦμαι καλὰ εἶναι μήτε δίκαια*, Xen. Eph. 3, 8 *ὅτι μὴ τὸ φάρμακον θανάσιμον ἦν;* so also in Acts vii. 48 *ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ*. Further, many expositors[3] think they find a misplaced negative also in Rom. iii. 9 *τί οὖν; προεχόμεθα; οὐ πάντως*, i.e. *by no means*

516 7th ed. (*πάντως οὔ* 1 Cor. xvi. 12). This interpretation is unavoidable, whether we translate *προεχόμεθα have we an advantage?* or *have we a pretext?* The linguistic admissibility of this signification is proved from Theogn. 305 (250 f.)[4] and Epiphan. haer. 38, 6, as well as by analogies such as *οὐδὲν πάντως* Herod. 5, 34, 65;[5] only a transposition, strictly speaking, is not to be thought of. The phrase is rather to be understood thus: *no, assuredly; no, by no means;* and the difference between *οὐ πάντως* when it meant *not*

[1] We must not, however, with *Fr.* Mr. p. 19, refer to this head *εὐθέως* (*εὐθύς*). In Mark ii. 8; v. 30 it belongs to the participle beside which it stands. Elsewhere, Mark i. 10; ix. 15, it is put at the beginning of the sentence (see above in the text), and is easily to be construed with the principal verb. Also *πάλιν* in 2 Cor. xii. 21 is not transposed, but made to precede the whole sentence: *lest again, when I come, God humble me.* So, probably, also *σχεδόν* in Heb. ix. 22 (as if, *and almost*) applies to the sentence: all things are purged with blood. Cf. Galen. protrept. c. 1 *τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ζῷα σχεδὸν ἄτεχνα πάντ' ἐστί*. Aristot. polit. 2, 8; Lys. ed. Auger I. p. 204.

[2] What *Valckenaer*, schol. N. T. II. 574, has adduced, is not all well selected. As to other passages, in which even recent scholars assert erroneously the existence of a trajection of the negation (e.g. Thuc. 1, 5; 3, 57), see *Sintenis*, Plut. Themist. p. 2.

[3] I do not understand on what grounds some of these expositors assert that *Grotius's* rendering: *not in all points*, is unwarranted. As little do I understand how *οὐ πάντως omnino non* is called a Hebraism. לֹא כֹל too in immediate connection means *non omnis*; *οὐ πᾶς* for *οὐδείς* is always so separated that the *verb* is negatived by the *οὐ*, see § 26, 1. לֹא בְכֹל, however, with the omission of the verb, which *Koppe* quotes in loc., I do not remember to have found in the O. T.

[4] Οἱ *κακοὶ οὐ πάντως κακοὶ ἐκ γαστρὸς γεγόνασιν,*
ἀλλ' ἄνδρεσσι κακοῖς συνθέμενοι φιλίην.

[5] But *οὐ πάνυ* (*μὴ πάνυ*) means everywhere, *not particularly.* It is sometimes mild as to the expression, but strong as to the sense, a sort of *litotes*, see *Weber*, Demosth. p. 340; *Franke*, Demosth. p. 62. In Rom., as above, the context and tone of the passage prevent us from rendering *οὐ πάντως* in the same way, by a species of *litotes* (earnest or ironical), *not entirely.*

entirely and when it denoted *entirely not*, was probably indicated by the mode of utterance. Hence it was without reason that van Hengel despaired of giving a satisfactory exposition of the passage, and concluded that there must be an unnoted corruption of the text. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. v. 9 f. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ... μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι πόρνοις, οὐ πάντως τοῖς πόρνοις τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, the expression οὐ πάντως signifies *non omnino* (Sext. Emp. Mathem. 11, 18), and the last words are a corrective explanation of μὴ συναναμ. πόρνοις: *to have no intercourse with fornicators, not absolutely with the fornicators of this world*, for then must ye needs go out of the world (but, strictly, with impure members of the church). So Luther. Likewise Heb. xi. 3 εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι is erroneously supposed to contain a transposed negation. It is, however, correctly rendered by Schulz: so that things which may be seen have not come of 490
things visible; cf. also Bengel in loc. That which is denied is, 6th ed.
ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι, and to this sentence the 577
negative is prefixed quite according to rule. The instance to which appeal is made of a transposition of a negation in 2 Macc. vii. 28 ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός is uncertain, as only Cod. Alex. has that reading. Tdf. has printed ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Lastly, 2 Cor. iii. 4 f. πεποίθησιν ... ἔχομεν, οὐχ ὅτι ἱκανοί ἐσμεν etc. must not be explained thus: ὅτι οὐχ (μή) etc. Rather is it to be rendered: *this confidence have we ...; not* (referring to 2 Cor. i. 24) *that we are sufficient through ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God.* In 2 Cor. xiii. 7 Paul states the aim of εὐχόμεθα ... μηδέν in the words οὐχ ἵνα ἡμεῖς δόκιμοι φανῶμεν, first negatively: *not that I* (if ye abstain from evil) *may appear approved* (as your teacher). In 1 Jno. iv. 10 the propriety of the arrangement οὐχ ὅτι is obvious. In Rom. iv. 12 the negation is not misplaced, but the singularity consists in the repetition of the article before στοιχοῦσιν; — a negligence of style which Fr. has tried to conceal by an artificial exposition, but which Philippi freely admits. In 517
regard to 1 Cor. xv. 51 πάντες (μὲν) οὐ κοιμηθησόμεθα, πάντες δὲ 7th ed.
ἀλλαγησόμεθα, even after the remarks of Fr. de conformatione text. Lachm. p. 38 sq. and of van Hengel Cor. p. 216 sqq., I can only agree with Mey. That is to say, vs. 52 shows that ἀλλάττεσθαι is not applied in the wider sense (to the risen also), but in the narrower, as opposed to ἐγείρεσθαι. The passage can only be rendered: *we shall all* (the generation whom Paul addressed) — *not fall asleep, — but all be changed.* Had Paul supposed that

some of the πάντες might die, they would then belong to the νεκροῖς, vs. 52, and ἡμεῖς would be an inexact antithesis. Any doubt respecting Paul's having been able to foretell a thing of this sort cannot induce me to assign to ἀλλάττ. in vs. 51 a signification different from what it has in vs. 52. Mey. has answered all other objections. That in Rom. xiii. 14 τῆς σαρκὸς πρόνοιαν μὴ ποιεῖσθε εἰς ἐπιθυμίας is not put for μὴ εἰς ἐπιθ. is doubtless on any supposition clear, see Fr. in loc. Translators, including Luther, have taken the liberty to make a transposition in 2 Cor. xii. 20; but the arrangement in Greek is perfectly regular.

In Rom. xv. 20 οὐχ ὅπου according to Bengel is used instead of ὅπου οὐκ for greater force, and according to BCrus. it is a milder, more modest, form of expression; whereas it is simply the only correct expression: οὕτως, 578 οὐχ ὅπου ... ἀλλά etc. In Rom. viii. 12 οὐ τῇ σαρκί suggests without help the antithesis ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι. To the (appropriate) variation in the position of the negative in Rom. ii. 14 ἔθνη τὰ μὴ νόμον ἔχοντα and νόμον μὴ ἔχοντες Bengel had already directed attention, see also Mey. in loc.

Some critics have thought that there is a hyperbaton in 2 Tim. ii. 6 τὸν κοπιῶντα γεωργὸν δεῖ πρῶτον τῶν καρπῶν μεταλαμβάνειν. The Apostle 491 according to vs. 5 appears to mean to say: the husbandman that *first* 6th ed. laboreth, must be partaker of the fruits, i.e. the husbandman must first labor, before he be partaker of the fruits; so that πρῶτον belongs to κοπιᾶν, and the sentence should run accordingly, cf. Xen. C. 1, 3, 18 ὁ σὸς πρῶτος πατὴρ τεταγμένα ποιεῖ, i.e. ὁ σὸς πατὴρ πρῶτος τετ. π. To get rid of the hyperbaton, Grotius makes πρῶτον signify *demum*, which is inadmissible. Later expositors, laying the emphasis on κοπ. as purposely placed first, explain the passage thus: the laboring (not the idle) husbandman has the first right to partake of the fruits, see, especially, Wiesinger in loc. Similar and even more remarkable hyperbata are not unfrequent in Greek prose; see Plat. rep. 7, 524 a.; Xen. Cyr. 2, 1, 5; cf. Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 21; Franke, Demosth. p. 33.

In Greek authors one or more words of a relative sentence are sometimes put before the relative (Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 109), for the sake of emphasis, see above, no. 3. Several expositors have attributed this idiom to Acts i. 2, and punctuated the passage thus: τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο; but with little probability, as ἐντέλλ. διὰ πνεύμ. ἁγ. was here (in reference to the sequel of the Acts) the only point of importance in Luke's mind; while ἐκλέγ. διὰ τοῦ πν. fell within the range of the pre- 518 vious history of the Gospel, and did not need to be stated here for the 7th ed. first time. The general reference contained in οὓς ἐξελέξ., by which primarily the apostles are indicated, is not superfluous, as it was by that previous election that they had been prepared to receive the directions διὰ τοῦ πν., see Valcken. in loc. There would be more ground for such

punctuation in Acts v. 35 προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς, ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις τί μέλλετε πράσσειν (see Bornem. in loc.), although the usual mode of connecting the words gives a suitable meaning: *take heed to yourselves in regard to these men, what ye intend to do.*

On the other hand, it is inconceivable that Luke could have written in Acts xxvii. 39 κόλπον τινὰ κατενόουν ἔχοντα αἰγιαλόν for αἰγ. ἔχοντα κόλπον τινά. Grotius long ago remarked: non frustra hoc additur, sunt enim sinus quidam maris, qui litus non habent, sed praeruptis rupibus cinguntur; see also Bengel. Moreover, αἰγ. ἔχοντα must be regarded as directly joined to the relative clause εἰς ὅν etc.: *which had a beach, on which they determined to land*, i.e. a beach of such a description as may have induced them to attempt a landing. It would be equally harsh to construe, as some do, Rom. vii. 21 εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλὸν ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται thus: τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ τὸν νόμον ποιεῖν, τὸ καλόν. 579
It has always appeared to me most natural to take the words thus: εὑρ. ἄρα τὸν νόμον, τῷ θέλ. . . . ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται invenio hanc legem (normam) volenti mihi honestum facere, ut mihi etc. See also Philippi in loc.

Many also find a trajection, sanctioned by long usage and even affecting the case (Mtth. 867), in Jno. xii. 1 πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα *six days before the Passover*, and xi. 18 ἦν ἡ Βηθανία ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε *about fifteen furlongs off*, cf. xxi. 8; Rev. xiv. 20. That is, it is thought that if the prepositions stood in the right place the language would run ἓξ ἡμέραις πρὸ τοῦ π., and ὡς σταδίους δεκ. ἀπὸ Ἱεροσ. (Luke 492
xxiv. 13). But probably in local specifications Greek phraseology pro- 6th ed.
ceded from a different view of the matter, ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκ. (properly: *situated at a distance of fifteen furlongs* i.e. *where the fifteen furlongs terminated, at the end of fifteen furlongs*), as in Latin e.g. Liv. 24, 46 Fabius cum *a quingentis fere passibus* castra posuisset; Ramshorn S. 273.[1] If now it were necessary to specify besides the speaker's position, it was added to the phrase in the Genitive. The same applies to specifications of time. As it was usual to say πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν *vor sechs Tagen, before* (the last past) *six days*, the form of expression was retained when it was necessary to indicate the point of time from which the period in question was counted, as πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα (cf. Evang. apocr. p. 436 f.). But whatever explanation we may give of the construction, both these forms of expression (the temporal and the local) were of frequent occurrence in later Greek, cf. Ael. anim. 11, 19 πρὸ πέντε ἡμερῶν τοῦ ἀφανισθῆναι τὴν Ἑλίκην, Xen. Eph. 3, 3; Lucian. Cronos 14; Geopon. 12, 31, 2; Achill. Tat. 7, 14 (and Jacobs in loc.); Epiphan. Opp. II. 248 a.; Strabo 10, 483; 15, 715 καταλαβεῖν ἄνδρας πεντεκαίδεκα ἀπὸ σταδίων εἴκοσι τῆς πόλεως, 51[illegible]
Plutarch. Philop. 4 ἦν ἀγρὸς αὐτῷ καλὸς ἀπὸ σταδίων εἴκοσι τῆς πόλεως, Diod. 7th ed.

[1] Polyaen. 2, 35 τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐκέλευσεν ἀπὸ βραχέος διαστήματος ἕπεσθαι is also illustrative.

S. 2, 7; Acta apocr. p. 39, 61; see Reiske, Const. Porphyrog. II. 20 ed. Bonn; Schaef. Long. p. 129. Kühnöl directs attention to the following passages of the Sept.: Amos i. 1 *πρὸ δύο ἐτῶν τοῦ σεισμοῦ*, iv. 7 *πρὸ τριῶν μηνῶν τοῦ τρυγητοῦ*, with Sing. *πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῆς Μαρδοχαϊκῆς ἡμέρας*, 2 Macc. xv. 36 (Joseph. antt. 15, 11, 4; Plut. symp. 8, 1, 1). Such phrases (in a temporal sense) are also composed with *μετά*, as in Plut. Coriol. 11 *μεθ' ἡμέρας ὀλίγας τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς τελευτῆς*, Malal. 4, p. 88 *μετὰ νβ' ἔτη τοῦ τελευτῆσαι τὴν Πασιφάην*, Anon. chron. (before Malal. ed. Bonn.) p. 10 *μετὰ δύο ἔτη τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ*, see Schaef. ad Bos, ellips. p. 553 sq.

6. The position of certain particles and enclitic pronouns is
580 fixed with greater or less precision in Greek, according to their importance in the sentence. For instance, *μέν* (*μενοῦνγε*, *μέντοι*), *οὖν*, *δέ*, *γάρ*, *γε*, *τοίνυν*, *ἄρα*, ought not to begin a sentence (*ἄρα* also ought not to begin an apodosis, Xen. C. 1, 3, 2; 8, 4, 7). With regard to most of these this rule is observed likewise in the N. T.;[1] and *δέ*, *γάρ*, *οὖν*, have sometimes the 2d, sometimes the 3d, sometimes even the 4th place (though the Codd. do not everywhere agree). They occupy the 3d or 4th place, particularly, when it is necessary to avoid separating words that are intimately connected [especially prepositional phrases], as in Gal. iii. 23 *πρὸ τοῦ δὲ ἐλθεῖν*, [Heb. i. 13 *πρὸς τίνα δὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων*], Mark i. 38 *εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐξελήλυθα*, Luke vi. 23; xv. 17; 2 Cor. i. 19 *ὁ τοῦ*
493 *θεοῦ γὰρ υἱός*, Acts xxvii. 14 *μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ἔβαλε* etc., Jno. viii. 16
6th ed. *καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ*, 1 Jno. ii. 2 *οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον*, 1 Cor. viii. 4 *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων*, 2 Cor. x. 1 *ὃς κατὰ πρόσωπον μὲν ταπεινός*, Jno. xvi. 22; Acts iii. 21. Cf. on *δέ* (Her. 8, 68; Aelian. anim. 7, 27; Xen. M. 2, 1, 16; 5, 4, 13; Diod. S. 11, 11; Thuc. 1, 6, 70; Arrian. Al. 2, 2, 2; Xen. eq. 11, 8; Lucian. eunuch. 4; dial. mort. 5, 1; Sext. Emp. math. 7, 65; Strabo 17, 808) Hm. Orph. p. 820; Boisson. Aristaenet. p. 687; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 302; III. I. 71; Stallb. Phileb. p. 90; Franke, Demosth. p. 208; on *γάρ* Schaef. melet. crit. p. 76; V. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 100; on *μέν* Hm. Orph. as above, Bornem. Xenoph. conv. p. 61; Weber, Demosth. 402. On the other hand, *ἄρα* (see Hm. Soph. Antig. 628) is frequently, contrary to Greek usage, placed *first*, as in Luke xi. 48; Rom. x. 17; 2 Cor. v. 15; Gal. ii. 21; v. 11 etc.; so also *ἄρα οὖν* in Rom. v. 18; vii. 3; 2 Thess. ii. 15; Eph. ii. 19, etc. Likewise *μενοῦνγε* begins a period

[1] *Ἔφη*, inserted in the direct discourse of a third party, occurs only in Acts xxiii. 35; but *φησί* in Matt. xiv. 8; Acts xxv. 5, 22; xxvi. 25, etc. Usually we find in the N. T. *ὁ Παῦλος ἔφη*, *ὁ δὲ ἔφη*, before the *oratio recta*, which in Greek authors is the more rare usage, *Mdv.* S. 260.

in Luke xi. 28; Rom. ix. 20; x. 18; see Lob. Phryn. p. 342; so also τοίνυν in Heb. xiii. 13. The latter very seldom begins a 520
sentence in the better authors; for instances in later writers, see 7th ed.
Lob. Phryn. l.c. They are especially frequent in Sext. Emp., as in Math. 1, 11, 14, 25, 140, 152, 155, 217, etc. Among the Byzantines, cf. Cinnam. p. 125, 136, ed. Bonn.[1]

Whether the indefinite τὶς can stand as the first word of a clause has been doubted, Mtth. Eurip. suppl. 1187 and Sprachl. 1081. Though from the nature of the case it may rarely begin a sentence, yet approved critics 581
have with high probability established its claim to the first place in Soph. Trach. 865, and Oed. R. 1471 (cf. vs. 1475), Aeschyl. Choeph. 640 (Hm.). In prose cf. Plat. Theaet. 147 c.; Plut. tranq. c. 13. In the N. T. τὶς beginning a sentence is established in Matt. xxvii. 47; Luke vi. 2; Jno. xiii. 29; 1 Tim. v. 24; Phil. i. 15.

Ἀλλά γε *yet at least* are, in the more ancient authors, always separated by a word (though it be but a particle), Klotz, Devar. p. 15 sq. This rule is not observed in Luke xxiv. 21 ἀλλά γε σὺν πᾶσι τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει, see Bornem. in loc.

Moreover, μέν is regularly placed after the word to which according to the sense it belongs.[2] There are, however, some exceptions to this rule: Acts xxii. 3 ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι ἀνὴρ Ἰουδαῖος, γεγεννημένος ἐν Ταρσῷ τῆς Κιλικίας, ἀνατεθραμμένος δὲ ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ (for ἐγώ ε. ἀ. Ἰ. γεγενν. μέν etc.), Tit. i. 15 πάντα μὲν καθαρὰ τοῖς καθαροῖς, τοῖς δὲ μεμιασμένοις καὶ ἀπίστοις οὐδὲν καθαρόν for τοῖς μὲν καθαρ. πάντα καθ. etc. or πάντα μὲν καθ. ... οὐδὲν δὲ 494
καθ. τ. μ., 1 Cor. ii. 15. Cf. Xen. M. 2, 1, 6; 3, 9, 8; Ael. anim. 2, 31; 6th ed.
Diog. L. 6, 60, see Hm. Soph. Oed. R. 436; Hartung, Partik. II. 415 f. Yet good Codd. have omitted μέν in the above three passages of the N. T. [Cod. Sin. also in the first two; yet in the second, corrector C has added μέν], and recent editors have accepted their authority. Might it not have been expunged because it was displeasing?

The proper position of τε is after the word which stands parallel to another, as in Acts xiv. 1 Ἰουδαίων τε καὶ Ἑλλήνων πολὺ πλῆθος, ix. 2; xx. 21; xxvi. 3. It is, however, not unfrequently inserted with more license, as in Acts xxvi. 22 (Elmsley, Eurip. Heracl. 622, yet cf. Schoem. Isae. p. 325); and, in particular, it stands immediately after a preposition or article, as in Acts x. 39; ii. 33; xxviii. 23; Jno. ii. 15, etc., in which

[1] But μέντοι always stands after some other word that commences the sentence. It is otherwise in later writers, see *Boissonade*, Anecd. II. 27.

[2] When several words have a grammatical connection, as article and noun, preposition and noun, μέν may be placed immediately after the first, e g. Luke x. 2 ὁ μὲν θερισμός, Heb. xii. 11 πρὸς μὲν τὸ παρόν, Acts i. 1; viii. 4 etc. (Demosth. Lacrit. 595 a.). So also μὲν οὖν in Lysias pecun. publ. 3 ἐν μὲν οὖν τῷ πολέμῳ. Cf. *Bornem.* Xen. conv. p. 61. This holds also of other conjunctions, see above, p. 363. Also the names of a single person are separated by such conjunctions, Jno. xviii. 10 Σίμων οὖν Πέτρος.

case it sometimes emphasizes them as belonging to the two parallel members alike, as in Acts xxv. 23 *σύν τε χιλιάρχοις καὶ ἀνδράσιν*, xiv. 5 ; x. 39 ; cf. Plat. legg. 7, 796 d. *εἰς τε πολιτείαν καὶ ἰδίους οἴκους*, Thuc. 4, 13 and the examples collected by Elmsley as above (also Joseph. antt. 17, 6, 2)
521 and Ellendt, lexic. Soph. II. 796. See, in general, Sommer in Jahn's
7th ed. Archiv I. 401 ff. In the same way *γε* is placed after an article or monosyllabic particle in Rom. viii. 32 ; 2 Cor. v. 3 ; Eph. iii. 2, cf. Xen. M. 1, 2, 27 ; 3, 12, 7 ; 4, 2, 22 ; Diod. S. 5, 40 ; see Matthiae, Eurip. Iphig. Aul. 498 ; Ellendt, as above, I. 344.

582 Many expositors, e.g. Schott, find a trajection of the *καί* (*even*) in Heb. vii. 4 *ᾧ καὶ δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν*, for *ᾧ δεκάτην καὶ Ἀβρ. ἔδ.* But the emphasis in this passage lies in the giving of a tenth, and Schulz has correctly translated it.

7. Violent transpositions of *clauses*[1] have been thought to occur

a. Acts xxiv. 22, where Beza, Grotius, and others, in explaining the words *ὁ Φῆλιξ, ἀκριβέστερον εἰδὼς τὰ περὶ τῆς ὁδοῦ, εἴπας, ὅταν Λυσίας καταβῇ, διαγνώσομαι* etc., include *εἰδώς* in the clause *εἴπας* etc. and render thus: *Felix, quando accuratius . . . cognovero, inquit, et Lysias huc venerit* etc. But the arrangement here is quite regular, as later expositors have perceived. Cf. Bornem. in Rosenm. Repert. II. 281 f.

b. 2 Cor. viii. 10 *οἵτινες οὐ μόνον τὸ ποιῆσαι ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θέλειν προενήρξασθε ἀπὸ πέρυσι*, where an inversion has been assumed : *non velle solum sed facere incepistis* (Grotius, Schott, Stolz, and others),[2] on account of vs. 11 *ἡ προθυμία τοῦ θέλειν*. This is wrong. The willing strictly indicates merely the decision (to collect), and if *προενήρξασθε* is spoken comparatively, that is with a reference to the Macedonian Christians, may be put before *ποιῆσαι*, as expressing a point of more importance : Not only in execution, but even in *intention*, ye were before the Macedonians. So much
495 the more fitting is it now, that the collection be quite completed.[3]
8th ed. It might have been quite possible for the Corinthians to have been first prompted by the decision of the Macedonians to a similar decision. Mey. in loc. (1st ed.) subtilizes and finally arrives at the

[1] On this subject see *W. Kahler*, satura duplex de veris et fictis textus sacri trajectionib. ex Evangg. et Actis Apost. collect. Lemgov. 1728. 4to., and *E. Wassenbergh*, de transposit. salub. in sanandis vett. scriptor. remedio. Franecq. 1786. 4to. (also reprinted in *Seebode's* Miscell. Crit. I. 141 sqq.).

[2] Syriac ܗܘ ܕܥܒܕ ܠܡܥܒܕ ܐܦ ܠܡܨܒ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ

[3] I cannot admit that in this sense vs. 11 must have run, *καὶ ἐπιτελέσατε τὸ ποιῆσαι* : the *θέλειν*, was, of course, completed long ago, but it is necessary to complete the *ποιῆσαι* also.

exposition propounded by Fritzsche (diss. in Cor. II. 9), which de Wette ably combats. This last critic has recently reproduced the above explanation [which Mey. also has adopted in his 2d, 3d, and 4th eds.], and I recall the view that I formerly upheld. As to Jno. xi. 15, see above, § 53, 10, 6, p. 459. (In Mark xii. 12 there is nothing whatever of the nature of a trajection. To the double clause is annexed, after its conclusion, the ground of the first member, and then in *καὶ ἀφέντες* etc. the result is expressed. 522
Similar is Mark xvi. 3. In Phil. i. 16 f. the two clauses should, 7th ed.
on the best testimony [Sin. also], be thus arranged: *οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἀγάπης . . . οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἐριθείας*, thus in converse relation to vs. 15; 583
this can perplex no reader.)

When, in the arrangement of individual clauses, the dependent are placed before the principal, e.g. telic clauses, as in Matt. xvii. 27; Acts xxiv. 4; Jno. i. 31; xix. 28, 31; 2 Cor. xii. 7; Rom. ix. 11 (see Fr. Rom. II. 297), relative clauses, as in Mark xi. 23; Jno. iii. 11; Rom. viii. 29 etc., conditional clauses, as in 1 Cor. vi. 4; xiv. 9, the grounds of such arrangement are obvious to every attentive reader, cf. Kühner II. 626. Here belongs, probably, also 1 Cor. xv. 2 *τίνι λόγῳ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν εἰ κατέχετε*; see Mey. in loc.

§ 62. INTERRUPTED STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; PARENTHESES.

1. Interrupted sentences are those whose grammatical flow is obstructed by the insertion of a clause complete in itself;[1] as, Acts xiii. 8 *ἀνθίστατο αὐτοῖς Ἐλύμας ὁ μάγος — οὕτως γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ — ζητῶν διαστρέψαι* etc., Rom. i. 13 *οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς — καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο — ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν*. The clause thus inserted is denominated a *parenthesis*,[2] and is usually separated visibly from the rest of the period by the well-known parenthetical marks.[3] According to the preceding definition the 496
6th ed.

[1] The definition given in *Ruddimann's* Institt. II. 396, ed. *Stallb.* is not amiss: parenthesis est sententia sermoni, antequam absolvatur, interjecta. *Wilke's* definition (Rhetor. S. 226) is too comprehensive.

[2] *Ch. Wolle*, comment. de parenthesi sacra. Lips. 1726. 4to.; *J. F. Hirt*, diss. de parenthesi et generatim et speciatim sacra. Jen. 1745. 4to.; *A. B. Spitzner*, comment. philol. de parenthesi libris V. et N. T. accommodata. L. 1773. 8vo.; *J. G. Lindner*, 2 comment. de parenthesibus Johanneis. Arnstad. 1765. 4to. (A work de parenthesibus Paullinis is a desideratum.) Cf. also *Clerici* ars crit. II. 144 sqq. Lips.; *Baumgarten*, ausführl. Vortr. über die Hermeneutik S. 217 ff.; *Keil*, Lehrbuch der Hermen. S. 58 f. (mostly incorrect).

[3] To throw away all external marks of a (true) parenthesis, and yet retain inter-

name of *parentheses* cannot be applied, in the first place, to inserted subordinate clauses, even though of considerable length, if they are connected in construction with the principal clause by a relative or as Gen. absol. (Rom. xvi. 4; ix. 1; 1 Pet. iii. 6; 1 Cor. v. 4;
584 Luke i. 70; ii. 23; Eph. vi. 2; Acts iv. 36), still less to clauses in apposition, such as Jno. xiv. 22; xv. 26; 1 Pet. iii. 21; 2 Jno. 1; Acts ix. 17; Mark vii. 2; 1 Cor. ix. 21, or to clauses annexed by way of explanation or reason to a *concluded* sentence, such as
523 Jno. iv. 6, 8, 10; xi. 2, 51 f.; xiii. 11; xviii. 5; xix. 23; Mark
7th ed. vii. 3 f. 26; Matt. i. 22 f.; Luke i. 55; Acts i. 15; viii. 16; Rom. viii. 36; 1 Cor. ii. 8; xv. 41; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. ii. 8; Heb. v. 13; viii. 5; vii. 11; Rev. xxi. 25, or lastly, to those with which the continuation of the discourse, beyond the alleged parenthesis, is grammatically connected, as 1 Cor. xvi. 5 ἐλεύσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὅταν Μακεδονίαν διέλθω (Μακεδονίαν γὰρ διέρχομαι), πρὸς ὑμᾶς δὲ τυχὸν παραμενῶ, where, indeed, *Μακεδ.* and *ὑμᾶς*, *διέρχ.* and *παραμ.* stand obviously in mutual relation, Gal. iv. 24; Heb. iii. 4; Jno. xxi. 8; Rom. ix. 11; Mark v. 13; vii. 26. Parentheses are introduced either asyndetically or by *καί* (Fr. Rom. I. 35) *δέ* or *γάρ* Rom. i. 13; vii. 1; Eph. v. 9; Heb. vii. 11; Jno. [xvii. 10] xix. 31; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Acts xii. 3; xiii. 8; 1 Jno. i. 2, and after them the construction either proceeds regularly, or is resumed (sometimes with some alteration) by the repetition of a word from the principal clause, with or without a conjunction, as in 2 Cor. v. 8; 1 Jno. i. 3. It does not, however, follow from the latter circumstance, that a series of words may be regarded as a parenthesis, as Eph. i. 13 ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς σωτηρίας ὑμῶν, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πιστεύσαντες ἐσφραγίσθητε etc. ii. 11 ff.; 1 Cor. viii. 1 (see Mey.); 2 Cor. v. 6 ff.; Jno. xxi. 21; so too, where the construction which had been commenced is not grammatically resumed, but the thread of discourse is continued in a new and independent form, the structure is not parenthetic, but anacoluthic (§ 63), e.g. Rom. v. 12 ff.

2. The number of parentheses in the N. T. is not small, but not so large as earlier expositors and editors (even Knapp) assumed. Besides the insertion of single words, which is common also in Greek and Latin authors (cf. nudius tertius), as in 2 Cor. viii. 3 *κατὰ δύναμιν*, *μαρτυρῶ*, *κ. παρὰ δύναμιν αὐθαίρετοι*, Heb. x. 29 *πόσῳ*,

punction, would be inconsistent. But in by far the greatest number of cases, commas suffice for distinguishing inserted words. Round brackets seem to be most suitable as parenthetical marks.

δοκεῖτε, χείρονος ἀξιωθήσεται τιμωρίας,[1] 2 Cor. x. 10 αἱ μὲν ἐπιστολαί, φησίν, βαρεῖαι (see above, § 58, 9), xi. 21; Rom. iii. 5, there are in the historical books frequent explanations respecting place, time, occasion etc. expressed parenthetically, as in Acts xii. 3 585
προσέθετο συλλαβεῖν καὶ Πέτρον — ἦσαν δὲ ἡμέραι τῶν ἀζύμων — ὅν etc., i. 15; xiii. 8; Luke ix. 28 ἐγένετο μετὰ τ. λόγους τούτους, ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτώ, καί etc. (cf. Isocr. Phil. p. 216; Lucian. dial. 497
mar. 1, 4),[2] Acts v. 7 ἐγένετο δέ, ὡς ὡρῶν τριῶν διάστημα, καὶ ἡ 6th ed.
γυνή etc., Matt. xv. 32 (cf. Lucian. dial. mar. 1, 4; Schaef. Demosth. 524
V. 388); Luke xxiii. 51; Jno. iii. 1 ἦν ἄνθρωπος, Νικόδημος 7th ed.
ὄνομα αὐτῷ, ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων, xix. 31 (Diog. L. 8, 42); Luke xiii. 24 πολλοί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ζητήσουσιν etc. Sometimes the narrator interrupts with such an explanation the direct discourse of another: Mark vii. 11 ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος· κορβᾶν, ὅ ἐστιν δῶρον, ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς, Jno. i. 39 οἱ δὲ εἶπον αὐτῷ· ῥαββί, ὃ λέγεται ἑρμηνευόμενον διδάσκαλε, ποῦ μένεις;[3] Sometimes an exhortation is thrust in in the same way, as Matt. xxiv. 15 f. ὅταν ἴδητε τὸ βδέλυγμα . . . ἑστὸς ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ, ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοείτω, τότε οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ etc.

3. There is no parenthesis in Jno. xi. 30: vs. 30 is so far connected with vs. 29 as it was necessary to mention the place to which Mary went; and after the narrator has completed the account of her going out, he passes in vs. 31 to her attendants

[1] Aristoph. Acharn. 12 πῶς τοῦτ' ἔσεισέ μου, δοκεῖς, τὴν καρδίαν; *Villois.* anecd. II. 24 πόσων, οἴεσθε, θυγατέρας . . . ἐξέδωκεν;

[2] The Greek idiom to which this has been compared by *Kühnöl* and others (the so called schema Pindaricum, see *Fischer*, Weller. III. 345 sq.; *Vig.* p. 192 sq.; *Hm.* Soph. Trach. 517; *Boeckh*, Pindar. II. II. 684 sq.; *J. V. Brigleb*, diss. in loc. Luc. ix. 28, Jen. 1739. 4to.) lies too remote, being almost exclusively poetic (*Kühner* II. 50 f.), and its application is not favored by ἐγένετο, usually employed absolutely (nowhere ἐγένοντο ἡμέραι ὀκτώ etc.). Further, Matt. xv. 32 also is to be explained in the same way as Luke ix. 28: ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς, προσμένουσί μοι according to the best Codd., where *Fr.*, overlooking the loose manner in which such specifications of time are introduced, has printed (from D): ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς εἰσι καὶ προσμέν. etc., which is a manifest correction. On Mark viii. 2, however, he has admitted the correctness of the common text. See also his letter Ueber die Verdienste *Tholuck's* S. 17. Also Luke xiii. 16 ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ σατανᾶς, ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη etc. I have no hesitation in taking, with *Bengel*, in the same way.

[3] Different from this is the case in which the writer subjoins incidentally such an explanation to the words of another, and then proceeds in his own person, Jno. ix. 7 ὕπαγε νίψαι εἰς τ. κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ, ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται ἀπεσταλμένος. ἀπῆλθεν οὖν etc., i. 42. 44; Matt. i. 22 f.; xxi. 4 f. In all these cases there is no trace of a parenthesis. Matt. ix. 6 is not so much a parenthesis as a blending of the oratio directa and indir.; and in Heb. x. 8 the author introduces, indeed, his own words in the midst of the quotation, but he does this by means of a relative clause.

who went out also. In Jno. xix. 5 the narrative proceeds quite regularly, for the change of subject does not render a parenthesis necessary. In Matt. xvi. 26 also parenthetical marks appear to be unnecessary (though Schulz has retained them); for vs. 26
586 adds to τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν ζημιωθῇ an illustration of the value of the ψυχή. In vs. 27 the reference is to vss. 25 and 26 inclusively; no interruption of the construction can be perceived. In xxi. 4 f. a remark is added by the narrator; but in vs. 6 the simple narrative continues. Similar is Jno. vi. 6. In Jno. i. 14 probably the words καὶ ἐθεασάμ. . . . πατρός were not regarded by the author as an insertion; but, after the completion of the complex sentence,
498 the summary πλήρης χάρ. κ. ἀληθ. is added in grammatical inde-
6th ed. pendence, somewhat as in Phil. iii. 19 or Mark xii. 40. Luke vii. 29 f. contain no parenthesis (Lchm.), but words of Christ, who previously, and again in vs. 31, is speaking. In Mark iii. 17 the assumption of a parenthesis is not sufficient to explain the construction, but vss. 16–19 are expressed in oratio variata, see
525 § 63 II. 1. There is no parenthesis in Jno. vi. 23; it is con-
7th ed. nected with ὅτι in vs. 22. The proposal of Ziegler (in Gabler's Journ. für theolog. Lit. I. 155) to include in a parenthesis the words καὶ ἦσαν . . . γυναικῶν Acts v. 12 ff. has, very properly, found no favor with editors (except Schott); and those critics also who have suspected something spurious in vss. 12–15 (Eichhorn, Beck, Kühnöl) have been too precipitate. The words ὥστε κατὰ τὰς πλατείας ἐκφέρειν τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς etc. are very aptly connected with vs. 14; the two facts, that the people held the apostles in high estimation, and that the number of believers increased, readily explain why the sick were brought out into the streets. The words, indeed, connect themselves with vs. 14 far more neatly than with vs. 12. Are we to understand by πολλὰ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα (ἐν τῷ λαῷ) merely the preceding events, the effect of which was ὥστε ἐκφέρειν etc.? To assume this would be to sacrifice the perspicuity of the narrative. For what else could those πολλὰ σημεῖα have been but miracles of healing? Thus in the words ὥστε κατά etc. what had been only briefly indicated in vs. 12 recurs in another connection to be narrated more in detail (vs. 15 f.). Accordingly, I cannot bring myself to make with Lchm. vs. 14 a parenthesis. On the other hand, in Acts x. 36 τὸν λόγον is probably to be connected with vs. 37, and the words οὗτος etc., which as a complete sentence express a leading thought that Peter could not well annex by a relative, form a parenthesis; and in vs. 37

the speaker, after this interruption, proceeds by an *amplification* of the thought.

4. In the Epistles also parentheses, especially short ones, occur, which contain sometimes a limitation, 1 Cor. vii. 11, sometimes a 587
corroboration, 1 Tim. ii. 7; 1 Thess. ii. 5, sometimes a reason or more precise explanation, Rom. vii. 1; 2 Cor. v. 7; vi. 2; x. 4; xii. 2; Gal. ii. 8; Eph. ii. 5; v. 9; Jas. iv. 14; 2 Thess. i. 10; 1 Jno. i. 2; 1 Tim. iii. 5, or any thought whatever that obtruded itself upon the writer (Col. iv. 10; Rom. i. 13). But we find in the Epistles some parentheses also of greater length, as in Heb. vii. 20 f. *οἱ μὲν γάρ . . . εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, since *καθ' ὅσον οὐ χωρὶς ὁρκωμοσίας* vs. 20 is obviously connected with vs. 22 *κατὰ τοσοῦτο κρείττονος* etc.; and in Rom. ii. 13–15, since vs. 16 *ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε κρινεῖ* etc. is after all most appropriately connected with *κριθήσονται* vs. 12, for *κρινεῖ* glances back at *κριθήσονται*. Vss. 13–15, however, constitute an independent group of thoughts, appended to vs. 12 as explanatory: it is the doing, not the hearing, of the law which is required, vs. 13; but the righteous heathen even are doers of 499
the law, vss. 14, 15. But many lengthened insertions are not 6th ed.
parentheses but digressions, inasmuch as they check merely the 526
progress of thought and not the sequence of construction. So in 7th ed.
1 Cor. viii. 1–3 Paul, after grammatically concluding the clause *περὶ δὲ . . . ἔχομεν*, allows himself, from *ἡ γνῶσις* to *ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*, to digress on *γνῶσις* in relation to *ἀγάπη*, and, resuming the thread of the discourse, returns in vs. 4 *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν* etc. to vs. 1. Similar digressions occur in 1 Cor. xv. 9, 10 and 2 Cor. iii. 14–18 (iv. 1 is connected with iii. 12). In Rom. xiii. 9 f. by *καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες* Paul returns to *μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε*, which is to be mentally repeated. Finally, in most of the passages usually adduced as parentheses, there is neither parenthesis nor digression: In Tit. i. 1 ff. *κατὰ πίστιν* is connected with *ἀπόστολος*, and the destination of Paul's apostleship is fully brought out in the clause *κ. πίστ. . . . αἰωνίου*, while to *ζωῆς αἰων.* is appended the relative clause *ἥν* as far as *θεοῦ*. Likewise in Rom. i. 1–7, where even Schott in his last edition assumes two parentheses, the whole passage flows with one unbroken thread, only the main conceptions in vss. 3 f. 5, 6 are amplified by relative clauses. So also in Col. iii. 12–14, where *ἀνεχόμενοι* (corresponding to *ἐνδύσασθε*) is a modal specification of *μακροθυμίαν* (perhaps also of *πραότητα*), but is itself re-enforced by *καθώς* etc. Only *οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς* may appear to interrupt the structure, as the thought is already expressed

through καθώς in the connection of the preceding clause; but if χαριζόμενοι be there supplied, the construction becomes regular. In Heb. xii. there is the less ground for regarding vss. 20, 21 as
588 a parenthesis (Lchm.), since in vs. 22 προσεληλύθατε is repeated from vs. 18; so that a new sentence begins, an affirmative opposed to the negative group of sentences vss. 18–21. In 1 Cor. i. 8 ὅς refers to Χριστός vs. 7, and vss. 5 and 6 contain no parenthesis. In Rom. xvi. 4 the two connected relative clauses occasion no real break in the structure and cannot be regarded as parenthetic. In 1 Pet. iii. 6 ἀγαθοποιοῦσαι is connected with ἐγενήθητε, and the words ὡς . . . τέκνα are not parenthetic. In Eph. iii. 5 ὃ ἑτέραις etc. is joined to ἐν μυστηρίῳ τοῦ X. vs. 4; and in 2 Pet. i. 5 (Schott) αὐτὸ τοῦτο δὲ σπ. παρεισενέγκαντες stands parallel to ὡς πάντα . . . δεδωρημένης etc., and vs. 4 is an explanatory relative clause to the words διὰ δόξης καὶ ἀρετῆς. On 1 Jno. iv. 17 ff.; Eph. i. 21 hardly any remark is required. In Eph. ii. 11 οἱ λεγ. . . . χειροπ. is an apposition to τὰ ἔθνη ἐν σαρκί, and the repetition of ὅτι in vs. 12 cannot convert what precedes into a parenthesis. Lastly, anacolutha occur in Col. iii. 16; 2 Pet. ii. 4–8 (in the latter passage occasioned by vs. 8, see § 63, I. 1 p. 569) and 1 Tim. i. 3 ff.

In Eph. iii. 1 ff. the Predicate is not ὁ δέσμιος, for then, if the meaning were ego Paulus vinculis detineor, the article would be omitted; and the
500 sense *I am the prisoner of Christ* (κατ' ἐξοχήν), does not recommend itself.
6th ed. The simplest mode of explaining the passage is, after Theodoret, to rec-
527 ognize in τούτου χάριν vs. 14 the resumption of the thought interrupted in
7th ed. vs. 1; especially as the intercession vs. 14 sqq. finds its appropriate occasion in the very fact that Paul had been by his imprisonment withdrawn from his personal labors, and τούτου χάριν also in vs. 1 receives its natural import. With far less probability others join iv. 1 to iii. 1, since there ὁ δέσμιος seems to refer to ἐγὼ ὁ δέσμιος. Cf. Cramer, translation of Eph. p. 71 ff., who quotes and tests other conjectures, and Harless.

§ 63. BROKEN AND HETEROGENEOUS STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; ANACOLUTHON, ORATIO VARIATA.

I. 1. Anacoluthon[1] occurs when the construction with which a

[1] *Hm.* Vig. 894 sqq. (who explains poetic anacolutha almost exclusively); *Poppo*, Thuc. I. I. 360 sqq.; *Kühner* II. 616 ff.; *Mdv.* 253 ff.; *F. Richter*, de praecip. graec. lingu. anacoluth. Mühlh. 1827 f. 2 spec. 4to.; *v. Wannowski*, Syntax. anomal. graec. pars cet. Lips. 1835. 8vo.: *F. W. Engelhardt*, Anacoluth. Plat. spec. 1–3, Gedani 1834 ff. 4to. (cf. *Gernhard*, Cic. offic. p. 441 sq.; *Matthiae*, de anacoluth. ap. Ciceron. in *Wolf*, Analect. lit. III. 1 sqq.). For the N. T. *Fritzsche*, Conjectan. spec. 1 (Lips. 1825 8vo.) p. 32 sq.

sentence began is not grammatically pursued; — either because 589
the writer is wholly diverted from the structure adopted at the beginning by something intervening (especially by parentheses, see Beier, Cic. off. II. 365), or because for the sake of a preferable mode of expression (Weber, Demosth. 538) he frames the close of his sentence otherwise than the commencement required.[1] Hence anacolutha are sometimes involuntary, sometimes intentional. To the latter class belong also those which have a rhetorical ground (Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 221), or which originate, as Hm. Vig. 895 expresses it, a motu animi vel ab arte oratoris vim aliquam captante. In writers of great mental vivacity and activity, more taken up with the thought than with the expression, anacolutha are most frequently to be expected. Hence they are especially numerous in the epistolary style of the Apostle Paul. We specially point out the following: Acts xv. 22 *ἔδοξεν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ... ἐκλεξαμένους ἄνδρας ἐξ αὐτῶν πέμψαι ... γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν* (Lys. in Eratosth. 7 *ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς ... ὥσπερ ... πεποιηκότες*, Antiphon. p. 613 Reisk. *ἔδοξεν αὐτῇ βουλομένῃ βέλτιον εἶναι μετὰ δεῖπνον δοῦναι, ταῖς Κλυταιμνήστρας τῆς τούτου μητρὸς ὑποθήκαις ἅμα διακονοῦσα*, vice versa Plat. legg. 3, 686 d. *ἀποβλέψας πρὸς τοῦτον τὸν στόλον, οὗ πέρι διαλεγόμεθα, ἔδοξέ μοι πάγκαλος εἶναι* — as, in general, often with *ἔδοξε* —, Plat. Apol. 501
21 c.; Xen. Cyr. 6, 1, 31; Lucian. Astrol. 3; Schwarz, soloecism. p. 6th ed.
86 sq.);[2] Acts xx. 3 *ποιήσας μῆνας τρεῖς, γενομένης αὐτῷ ἐπιβουλῆς* 528
... μέλλοντι ἀνάγεσθαι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν, ἐγένετο γνώμη, etc. In 7th ed.
Rom. xvi. 25–27 *τῷ δυναμένῳ ... μόνῳ σοφῷ θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χρ., ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, Paul is led away from the intended construction by his extended statement respecting God in vss. 25, 26, and, instead of immediately annexing *ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, forms a relative clause out of the contents of the doxology, as if the Dative *θεῷ* concluded a sentence. Similar is Acts xxiv. 5, where *ἐκρατήσαμεν* vs. 6 should without anything further have been added to the participle *εὑρόντες τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον*; Luke, however, led astray 590
by the relative clause *ὃς καί* etc. has made it, too, a part of the relative sentence: *ὃν καὶ ἐκρατ.* More remarkable are the anacolutha in periods of smaller extent:[3] as in Acts xix. 34 *ἐπιγνόντες*,

[1] Accordingly, in 1 Jno. i. 1 ff. there is no anacoluthon, as vs. 3, by a grammatically regular repetition of the words of the first verse after the intermediate clause vs. 2, is connected strictly with the beginning of the sentence.

[2] In Latin cf. Hirt. bell. afric. 25 dum haec ita fierent, *rex Juba*, cognitis ..., *non est visum*, etc. Plin. ep. 10, 34.

[3] One of the most singular is perhaps that adduced by *Kypke* II. 104: Hippocr. morb

ὅτι Ἰουδαῖός ἐστι, φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων (instead of ἐφώνησαν ἅπαντες), Mark ix. 20 ἰδὼν (ὁ παῖς) αὐτόν, τὸ πνεῦμα εὐθὺς ἐσπάραξεν αὐτόν (instead of ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐσπαράχθη), to which Fr. compares Anthol. pal. 11, 488 (?) κἀγὼ δ' αὐτὸν ἰδών, τὸ στόμα μου δέδεται, see also Plat. legg. 6, 769 c. Further, in Luke xi. 11 τίνα ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσει ὁ υἱὸς ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; the question, *will he give?* pre-supposes a protasis: *a father when asked for bread by his son*, or, a father *whom his son asks for bread* (Matt. vii. 9). So too in Acts xxiii. 30 μηνυθείσης μοι ἐπιβουλῆς εἰς τὸν ἄνδρα μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι, where the construction should have continued μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι; whereas μέλλειν might have been employed, had the clause been introduced somehow thus: μηνυσάντων ἐπιβουλήν, etc. Cf. § 45, 6. Probably the construction was intentionally altered in 1 Cor. xii. 28 οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πρῶτον ἀποστόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους etc., where Paul at first meant to write οὓς μὲν . . . ἀποστ., οὓς δὲ προφ. etc.; but instead of employing mere juxtaposition, he preferred an arrangement according to rank, so that now οὓς μέν stands quite isolated, and the subsequent abstracts also, ἔπειτα δυνάμεις, are appended to the simple ἔθετο, which alone the writer still had in his mind. Likewise in Tit. i. 3 the Apostle, by the introduction of τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ in connection with ἐφανέρωσε δὲ etc., seizes on a more suitable turn of expression. Cf. besides 2 Cor. vii. 5 (1 Cor. vii. 26). Still more incoherent are the composite parts of an anacoluthic period in Jno. vi. 22 τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος . . . ἰδών, ὅτι . . . (ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθε πλοιάρια . . .), ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν
529 ὁ ὄχλος etc., where εἶδεν in consequence of the words inserted
7th ed. has acquired a more comprehensive object than belonged to ἰδών.

In Gal. ii. 6 ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναί τι — ὁποῖοί ποτε ἦσαν, οὐδέν
502 μοι διαφέρει — ἐμοὶ γὰρ οἱ δοκοῦντες οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο, where the
6th ed. Apostle should have continued in the Passive, but is so disturbed by the parenthetic clause that he frames a new sentence with γάρ.[1]

vulg. 5, 1 ἐν Ἡλίδι ἡ τοῦ κηπωροῦ γυνὴ πυρετὸς εἶχεν αὐτὴν ξυνεχὴς καὶ φάρμακα πίνουσα οὐδὲν ὠφελέετο. Cf. also Bar. 1, 9 μετὰ τὸ ἀποικίσαι Ναβουχοδονόσορ τὸν Ἰεχονίαν . . . καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτόν, etc. Act. apocr. p. 69.

[1] In sense *Herm.'s* explanation (Progr. de locis ep. ad Gal. p. 7) agrees with this. He assumes, however, an aposiopesis after ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δοκ. . . . τι. See in opposition, *Fritzsche*, 2d Progr. p. 13. (*Fritzschior.* Opusc. 211 sq.). The latter considers the words ἀπὸ . . . τι, with which as he thinks vs. 5. should conclude, as parallel to διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδ., and renders: *propter irreptitios autem et falsos sodales* (sc circumcidi non passus est), *quippe qui . . . quibus . . . ut . . . a viris autem, qui auctoritate valerent* (circumcisionis necessitatem sibi imponi non sivit). See, on the other hand, *Meyer.* I have found no reason to give up my view of the passage.

So in vs. 4 f. *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδέλφους . . . οἷς οὐδὲ* 591
πρὸς ὥραν εἴξαμεν τῇ ὑποταγῇ etc., the parenthetical insertion in vs. 4 occasioned the anacoluthon. The Apostle might either have said: *on account of the false brethren* (to please them) . . . *we did not cause Titus to be circumcised;* or, *we could by no means* (in this respect) *give way to the false brethren.* The two constructions are here blended.[1] In Rom. ii. 17 ff., vss. 17–20 constitute the protasis, and vs. 21 begins the apodosis. Paul, having continued through several clauses the thought which he brought out as protasis, loses sight of *εἰ* vs. 17, and in appending the apodosis vs. 21 falls into another construction by means of *οὖν*, which particle indicates an anacoluthon. The explanation differs but little, if *οὖν* be taken for a conjunction employed to resume and sum up the protasis (Klotz, Devar. II. 718 sq.), as it very frequently in Greek authors begins the apodosis. For the words *ὁ διδάσκων* etc. *ὁ κηρύσσων* etc., whether they be taken as a question or as a reproachful assertion, alter the natural course of the sentence. That is to say, after the protasis *εἰ δέ* etc. the sentence would simply run: *thou shouldst carry into effect this knowledge of the law by a corresponding conduct* (cf. vs. 23). That the construction selected by Paul is more forcible is obvious.[2] The anacoluthon in the following passages is harsher: In 2 Pet. ii. 4 the protasis *εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων οὐκ ἐφείσατο* etc. has no grammatical apodosis. The Apostle meant to say: *neither* (much less) *will he spare these* 530
false teachers. But as one instance of divine punishment sug- 7th ed.
gested itself to his mind after another (vss. 4–8), he first in vs. 9 592
reverts with an altered construction to the thought (generalizing 503
it also) which was to form the apodosis. In Rom. v. 12, to the 6th ed.
words *ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε* one might have expected the apodosis: *οὕτω δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου (Χριστοῦ) δικαιοσύνη καὶ διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἡ ζωή.* But, by the

[1] To repeat, with *Fr.* (Progr. I. in ep. ad Gal. p. 24, Opusc. p. 178 sq.), after *διὰ δὲ τοὺς παρεισάκτους ψευδαδ.*, the words *οὐκ ἠναγκάσθη περιτμ.* (*ὁ Τίτος*) is no easier at all. Paul, unless we regard him as an inexpert writer, could only omit these words in case the appended relative clauses had made him lose sight of the commencement of the period. But in this way the explanations of the sentence, which is at any rate irregular, amount pretty much to the same thing. Besides, there would be no singularity of style in the statement: *but not even Titus . . . was compelled to be circumcised. And because of the false brethren stealthily brought in, he did not allow himself to be compelled* (to be circumcised).

[2] In a grammatical point of view cf. Xen. C. 6, 2, 9, where the commencement *ἐπεὶ δὲ . . . ἦλθον* etc. § 12 is resumed in the words *ὡς οὖν ταῦτα ἤκουσεν ὁ στρατὸς τοῦ Κύρου,* and the apodosis connected with it.

explanation annexed in vss. 12–14 to εἰς ἦλθεν ἡ ἁμαρτία καὶ ὁ θάνατος, the regular construction is broken off (though in ὅς ἐστι τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος an intimation of the antithesis is given); and besides, the Apostle recollects that not merely a simple *parallel* between Adam and Christ might be drawn (ὥσπερ ... οὕτως), but that something greater and more pervasive has proceeded from Christ than from Adam. Hence the epanorthosis πολλῷ μᾶλλον, which was noticed by so early an expositor as Calvin. The connection is resumed in the words ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα etc. vs. 15, which logically absorb the apodosis, and in εἰ γὰρ ... ἀπέθανον the substance of the protasis vs. 12 is briefly recapitulated. After this Paul combines vs. 18 the twofold parallel (likeness and unlikeness) in one final result. In a similar way must be explained 1 Tim. i. 3 ff. Καθὼς παρεκάλεσα entirely wants an apodosis, which escaped the attention of Paul while he was introducing directly into the protasis the object of παρακαλεῖν. The apodosis should run thus: οὕτω καὶ νῦν παρακαλῶ, ἵνα παραγγείλῃς etc. To consider vss. 5–17 as a parenthesis, as even Bengel does, is wholly unnatural; it is still more absurd, however, to take καθώς for an untranslatable particle of transition (Heydenreich). Many ancient and modern expositors regard Rom. ix. 22 ff. as a very singular and in part double anacoluthon; see the different views in Reiche. But it is probably simpler to join καὶ ἵνα vs. 22 to ἤνεγκεν, and at the end of vs. 23 to conceive the apodosis as suppressed: *If God, determined to show forth his wrath, bore with all long-suffering the vessels of his wrath, ... also in order to make known the riches* etc. ...: *what then? what shall we say?* (must not, then, all censure be silent?). The *bearing* of the σκεύη ὀργῆς is not merely regarded as a proof of his μακροθ., but, at the same time, as occasioned by the purpose of bringing to view the riches of his glory which he destined for the σκεύη ἐλέους. The instant destruction of the σκεύη ὀργῆς (in this case the unbelieving Jews) would have been perfectly just; but God endured them with long-suffering (thus tempering his justice with kindness), both the aim and the result of this being the more striking display
593 (by the contrast) of the greatness of his grace towards the σκεύη
531 ἐλέους. The δέ in vs. 22 is not οὖν, and hence the continuation of
7th ed. the thought expressed in vss. 20, 21 is not probable. That God is perfectly free in bestowing the tokens of his grace, had been sufficiently stated. The creature cannot contend with the Creator. — that is enough. But, resumes Paul, God is not so rigorous as

he might be, and have no fear of the censure of men. [It is probably still simpler, without supplying an apodosis, to take εἰ . . . ἤνεγκεν as the condition, and καὶ (sc. ἤνεγκεν) ἵνα vs. 23 as the conclusion: if God . . . endured . . ., he endured them *also* or *at the same time to the end that*, etc.] As to Acts x. 36 see above, § 62, 3 p. 564. On Rom. xii. 6 ff. see below, II. 1 p. 578. Col. i. 21 is in any event an anacoluthon, whether we read with Lchm. ἀποκατηλλάγητε, or with the text. rec. ἀποκατήλλαξεν. On 2 Pet. i. 17 see § 45, 6 b. p. 351, and on 1 Cor. xii. 2 Meyer. 504 6th ed.

In several other passages where expositors have thought they found an anacoluthon, I can discover nothing of the sort. Rom. vii. 21 εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν, ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται, where according to Fr. (Conject. p. 50) there is a blending of two constructions, has by this scholar been subsequently explained otherwise, that is, in accordance with Knapp's view; see above, § 61, 5 p. 557. Likewise, in Heb. viii. 9 there is no blending of two constructions (Fr. Conject. p. 34). The quotation from the Sept. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν may be an unusual expression, but it is not incorrect. The form of the expression was unquestionably occasioned by the Hebrew (for it is a quotation from Jer. xxxi. 32) בְּיוֹם הֶחֱזִיקִי בְיָדָם. The participle is used instead of the Infin., as in Jer. xxix. 2; cf. Bar. ii. 28. In 1 Pet. ii. 7 ἀπειθοῦσι δέ is grammatically connected with the words of the quotation, οὗτος ἐγενήθη etc. In Rom. i. 26, 27 a decision is difficult because the reading varies between ὁμοίως δὲ καί and ὁμοίως τε καί. The former appears to have more external evidence in its support; and Bornem. (neues theol. Journ. VI. 145) has preferred it (as well as Lchm.), and endeavored to vindicate it by the frequent recurrence of the expression in the N. T. Matt. xxvi. 35; xxvii. 41 (Mark xv. 31); Luke v. 10; x. 32; 1 Cor. vii. 3 f.; Jas. ii. 25, and also in Greek authors, as Diod. Sic. 17, 111. But as none of these passages is preceded by τε, they are inadequate; cf., however, the passage quoted by Fr. from Plat. symp. 186 e. ἥ τε οὖν ἰατρικὴ . . . ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ γυμναστική. Grammatically, therefore, the reading supported by the most authoritative Codd. may be defended, and would even be very appropriate, as the Apostle obviously wishes to give the greater prominence to what was done by the ἄῤῥενες (he dwells on it in vs. 27, severely condemning the wickedness). Now comes the question whether either or both of these two readings causes an anacoluthon? With the reading ὁμ. τε καί [Cod. Sin.] there is no more an anacoluthon than in the Latin *nam et feminae . . . et similiter etiam mares.* On the other hand, if we read ὁμ. δὲ καί the natural sequence is broken, exactly as in Latin *et feminae . . . similiter vero etiam mares.* Klotz, Devar. II. 740. In Heb. iii. 15 we must probably seek for the apodosis in vs. 16 τίνες γάρ *quinam* etc., as Bleek, Tholuck, and others have done. In 2 Cor. 594 532 7th ed.

viii. 3 αὐθαίρετοι is connected with ἑαυτοὺς ἔδωκαν vs. 5. In 1 Cor. v. 11, in the words τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν we ought not with Erasmus to find an anacoluthon, but an intensive repetition of συναναμίγν. In Jas. ii. 2 ff. the anacoluthon disappears, if vs. 4 καὶ οὐ etc. be taken interrogatively, as is done now by most critics, and also by Lchm. Jno. xiii. 1 contains no grammatical anacoluthon; the difficulty must be disposed of hermeneu-
505 tically. 1 Cor. ix. 15, if ἵνα before τις is spurious (Tdf. has restored it),
6th ed. would be not so much an anacoluthon as an aposiopesis, see Mey. Lastly, in Eph. iii. 18 the participles are probably to be connected with the clause ἵνα ἐξισχύσητε etc., see Mey. in loc.

2. The anacolutha hitherto elucidated are of such a nature that they might occur in any language. But in Greek certain peculiar species of anacoluthon became established by usage, which must now be mentioned:

a. If a sentence is continued by means of participles, these, when at a distance from the governing verb, not unfrequently assume an abnormal case (see Vig. p. 337 sqq.; Rost 704), e.g. Eph. iv. 2 f. παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς . . . περιπατῆσαι . . . ἀνεχόμενοι ἀλλήλων ἐν ἀγάπῃ, σπουδάζοντες etc. (as if the exhortation were direct: περιπατήσατε), also i. 18 (where Meyer makes unnecessary difficulties); Col. iii. 16 ὁ λόγος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐνοικείτω ἐν ὑμῖν πλουσίως, ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς etc.; ii. 2 ἵνα παρακληθῶσιν αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν συμβιβασθέντες ἐν ἀγάπῃ etc. (as if παρακαλεῖσθαι were referred to the persons themselves), Col. ii. 10 [?]; 2 Cor. ix. 10 f. ὁ ἐπιχορηγῶν . . . χορηγήσαι καὶ πληθύναι τὸν σπόρον ὑμῶν . . . ὑμῶν, ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι etc.; vs. 12 f. ἡ διακονία (ἐστὶ) περισσεύουσα διὰ πολλῶν εὐχαριστιῶν, διὰ τῆς δοκιμῆς τ. διακονίας ταύτης δοξάζοντες τὸν θεόν (as if ὅτι πολλοὶ εὐχαριστοῦσιν had preceded) cf. Xen. Cyr. 1, 4, 26. See also 2 Cor. i. 7; vii. 5; Phil. i. 29 f.; iii. 10; 2 Pet. iii. 3; Acts xxvi. 3; Jude 16. Cf. in general, Markland, Lys. p. 364, Reiske Vol. V.; Buttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 110; Seidler, Eurip. Iphig. T. 1072; Kühner II. 377 f.; Schwarz, soloecism. p. 89, also Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 135 sq. and sympos. p. 33. Some of the anacolutha of this sort may be considered as intentional. The
595 thoughts when expressed by the Nom. of participles receive greater prominence; whereas the oblique cases merge them rather in the sentence as a whole (singularly so in Jude 16), and are marked as accessory. But most of them are occasioned by the author's having intended, in the preceding part of the sentence, to employ a different substantive, kindred in sense. Besides, cf. Evang. apocr. pp. 169, 445.

Of another sort are Mark xii. 40; Phil. iii. 18 f., on which see § 59, 8 b. 533
p. 532. In Rom. xiii. 11 *καὶ τοῦτο εἰδότες* is connected with *ὀφείλετε* vs. 8; 7th ed.
and 1 Pet. ii. 16 connects itself, as the ideas suggest, with the Imperative *ὑποτάγητε* in vs. 13.

b. Frequently after a participle the construction passes over into a finite verb, which is apt to be accompanied by *δέ*; as, Col. i. 26 *πληρῶσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων . . . νυνὶ δὲ ἐφανερώθη* instead of *νυνὶ δὲ φανερωθέν* (cf. Her. 6, 25; Thuc. 1, 67), 1 Cor. vii. 37 *ὃς ἕστηκεν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἔχων ἀνάγκην, ἐξουσίαν δὲ ἔχει* (instead of *ἔχων*).[1] We must 506
not, with Meyer, refer to this head 1 Cor. iv. 14; nor Eph. ii. 3, 6th ed.
where *ἦμεν* is parallel to *ἀνεστράφημεν*. This transition occurs without *δέ* in Eph. i. 20 *κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν . . . ἣν ἐνήργησεν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἐγείρας αὐτὸν . . . καὶ ἐκάθισεν*, 2 Cor. vi. 9; Jno. v. 44; Col. i. 6 (Paus. 10, 9, 1). As to 2 Jno. 2 see below, II. 1 p. 578. An effort to attain a more simple structure, or to give prominence to the second thought (particularly in 2 Cor. vi. 9; cf. Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 29), is not unfrequently the cause of such an anacoluthon. Heb. viii. 10 (from the O. T.) is to be explained thus: *αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη, ἣν διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ . . . δι δοὺς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ἐπιγράψω αὐτούς.* To render *καί* before *ἐπιγρ.* by *etiam*, as some (Böhme, for instance) do, is forced, and far from being favored by x. 16. As to Jno. i. 32 *τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον . . . καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν* (cf. vs. 33 *ἐφ' ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον καὶ μένον ἐπ' αὐτόν*), the correct explanation has already been indicated by BCrus. Cf. also Schaef. Dion. H. p. 31 and Demosth. II. 75; V. 437, 573, also Plutarch. IV. 323; Blume, Lycurg. p. 147; Mtth. S. 1527 f. In the Codd. in such passages the participle is sometimes found as a correction, e.g. in Eph. as above, where Lchm. nevertheless has adopted *καθίσας* as genuine. A kindred sort of anacoluthon occurs in 2 Cor. v. 6 ff. *θαῤῥοῦντες οὖν πάντοτε . . . θαῤῥοῦμεν δὲ καὶ εὐδοκοῦμεν*, where Paul, after several intermediate clauses, repeats *θαῤῥοῦντες*, which he intended to construe with *εὐδοκ.*, in 596
the form of the finite verb.

c. A clause, which had begun with *ὅτι*, concludes with the (Acc. and) Infin., as if that particle had not been employed at all; as, Acts xxvii. 10 *θεωρῶ, ὅτι μετὰ ὕβρεως καὶ πολλῆς ζημίας . . . μέλλειν ἔσεσθαι τὸν πλοῦν* cf. Plat. Gorg. 453 b. *ἐγὼ γὰρ εὖ*

[1] The case examined by *Hm.* Soph. El. p. 153, and *Buttm.* Demosth. Mid. p. 149, is different.

ἴσθ' ὅτι, ὡς ἐμαυτὸν πείθω, εἴπερ . . . καὶ ἐμὲ εἶναι τούτων ἕνα, see above, § 44, note 2, p. 339. On the other hand, in Aelian. 12, 39 the construction φασὶ Σεμίραμιν is founded on an Acc. with the
534 Inf., but is followed by μέγα ἐφρόνει, as if ὅτι had preceded. Similar
7th ed. is Plaut. Trucul. 2, 2, 62. With this may be compared also Jno. viii. 54 ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐστι (where θεὸν ὑμῶν εἶναι might have been used). This, however, is rather to be considered as Attraction ; see below.

d. The principal verb in the sentence does not regularly correspond to the Nominative or Acc. placed at the beginning of the sentence (casus pendentes, Wannowski, Syntax. anomal. p. 54 sq. ; see, however, H. L.-Z. 1836. I. 338) ; as, 1 Jno. ii. 24 ὑμεῖς, ὃ ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἐν ὑμῖν μενέτω, and vs. 27 καὶ ὑμεῖς, τὸ χρίσμα ὃ ἐλάβετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν ὑμῖν μένει *and you, the anointing, which . . . abides in you.* In both passages, ὑμεῖς, if placed in the relative clause (Lchm.), would in that position of precedence be too emphatic. Luke xxi. 6 ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε, ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι, ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ etc. *these things which ye behold,— there will come days in which* (even to the last stone they will be
507 destroyed) *not a stone* (of them) *will be left on another.* So also
6th ed. in Jno. vi. 39 ; vii. 38 ; xv. 2 ; Matt. vii. 24 ; xii. 36 ; Rev. ii. 26 ; iii. 12, 21 ; vi. 8. Cf. Exod. ix. 7 ; Xen. Cyr. 2, 3, 5 ; Oec. 1, 14 ; Ael. 7, 1. 2 Cor. xii. 17 μή τινα ὧν ἀπέσταλκα πρὸς ὑμᾶς, δι' αὐτοῦ ἐπλεονέκτησα ὑμᾶς ; for, *have I sent to you any one of those* etc. *in order to defraud you?* Rom. viii. 3 τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου, ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει . . . ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας . . . κατέκρινε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, *what to the law was impossible . . . God condemned, sending his Son, sin in the flesh*, for, *that God did, and condemned* etc. Here, however, τὸ ἀδύν. may also be regarded as a predicate placed before a proposition complete in itself, and may be resolved ὃ γὰρ ἀδύνατόν ἐστι, like Heb. viii. 1 κεφάλαιον ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, τοιοῦτον ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα etc. see § 32, 7 p. 231 ; cf. Kühner II. 156.

Several critics, Olsh. among them, have supposed that there is an Accus. absol. (?) in Acts x. 36 τὸν λόγον ὃν ἀπέστειλε τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραήλ etc. *the*
597 *word, which* (or which word) *he sent first to the children of Israel* (namely, the word vs. 35 ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει etc.). Yet see § 62, 3 p. 564.

An anacoluthon peculiar to the N. T. sometimes occurs, where the writer proceeds in the words of an O. T. statement instead of in his own, e.g. Rom. xv. 3 καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτῷ ἤρεσεν, ἀλλά, καθὼς γέγραπται, οἱ ὀνειδισμοὶ τῶν ὀνειδιζόντων σε ἐπέπεσαν ἐπ' ἐμέ (instead of — but, to please

God, he submitted to the cruelest reproaches) vs. 21; ix. 7; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9; iii. 21; Heb. iii. 7. Yet see below, § 64, 7 p. 598.

e. Under the head of anacoluthon comes also the use of μέν without a subsequent parallel clause (made prominent by δέ), Hm. Vig. 841 sq. In this case either

α) the parallel member is easily to be supplied from the clause with μέν, being in a manner included in it, as in Heb. vi. 16 ἄνθρωποι μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ὀμνύουσι *men swear by the greater*, but God can swear only by himself, cf. vs. 13 (Plat. Protag. 334 a.), yet this μέν is doubtful [and wanting also in Cod. Sin.]; Col. ii. 23 ἅτινά ἐστι λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καί etc. *which, indeed, have an appearance of wisdom*, but in fact are not (Xen. An. 1, 2, 1), Rom. x. 1, where perhaps Paul purposely avoided the painful antithesis (which is brought out in vs. 3 but softened by a compliment), see further 1 Cor. v. 3. Cf. Xen. Hier. 1, 7; 7, 4; Mem. 3, 12, 1; Plat. Phaed. 58 a.; Aristoph. pax 13; see Stallb. Plat. Crit. p. 105; Held, Plutarch. A. Paull. p. 123. Or 5 5th ed.

β) the antithetic member is evidently added, but in another construction; as, Rom. xi. 13 f. ἐφ' ὅσον μὲν οὖν εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐθνῶν ἀπόστολος, τὴν διακονίαν μου δοξάζω, εἴπως παραζηλώσω μου τὴν σάρκα etc. Here the clause with δέ lies wrapt up in εἴπως παραζ., instead of Paul's writing regularly: *inasmuch as I am the apostle of the Gentiles, I glorify mine office* (preaching zealously to the Gentiles), *but I have in this the benefit of the Jews in view* (I will thus render the Jews emulous), I am, indeed, in fact an apostle to the Gentiles, but at the same time in purpose an apostle to the Jews. Or 508 6th ed.

γ) the construction is entirely broken off, and the parallel clause must be gathered by the reader from the sequel, e.g. Acts i. 1 τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων . . . ἀνελήφθη. Now the writer ought to proceed: *and the history from this point of time* (the Ascension) *I will narrate now in the second part of my work;* but by the mention of the *apostles* vs. 3 he is led to refer to Christ's appearance after his resurrection, and connects immediately with this the continuation of the narrative. Rom. vii. 12 ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος καὶ ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή *the law, indeed, is holy, and the commandment is holy* etc. but ἁμαρτία, made active in the σάρξ, misuses it (in the way indicated vs. 8). This thought the Apostle brings out in vs. 13 by a different turn of expression. Cf. further, Rom. i. 8; iii. 2; 1 Cor. xi. 18 (in all these cases πρῶτον μέν, see below), Heb. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xii. 12 (see Rück. in loc.), Acts 598

iii. 13; xix. 4 (in the last passage μέν is not fully established), xxvi. 4. Instances in Greek writers are, Eurip. Orest. 8; Xen. C. 2, 1, 4; 4, 5, 50; Mem. 1, 2, 2; 2, 6, 3; Plato, Apol. 21 d.; Reisig, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 398; Locella, Xen. Ephes. p. 225 and many others. In Luke viii. 5 ff.; Jno. xi. 6; xix. 32; Jas. iii. 17 the correlative particle is not entirely omitted, only for δέ we find sometimes ἔπειτα (Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 133; Schaef. melet. p. 61), sometimes καί; and that even in Greek authors μὲν ... ἔπειτα, μὲν ... καί (Thuc. 5, 60 and 71), μὲν ... τε are used correlatively, is well known, and not strange, cf. Ast, Plat. legg. p. 230; Matthiae, Eurip. Orest. 24; Baiter, ind. ad Isocr. paneg. p. 133; Weber, Demosth. 257; Maetzner, Antiph. pp. 209, 257. Sometimes the clause with δέ is somewhat remote, as in 2 Cor. ix. 1, 3 (Thuc. 2,
536 74), probably also in 1 Cor. xi. 18 (see just below); or as respects
7th ed expression is not completely parallel, as in Gal. iv. 24, 26.

Rom. i. 8 πρῶτον μὲν εὐχαριστῶ etc. is unquestionably an anacoluthon. The Apostle when he used this phrase had in mind a δεύτερον or εἶτα, which, however, in consequence of a change in the thought does not follow. The remark of Wyttenbach (Plut. Mor. I. 47, ed. Lips.) is applicable here: si solum posuisset πρῶτον, poterat accipi pro *maxime, ante omnia* (so it is rendered by nearly all expositors); nunc quum μέν addidit, videtur voluisse alia subjungere, tum sui oblitus esse. Cf. also Isocr. Areopag. p. 344; Xen. M. 1, 1, 2; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 142; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 191. In 1 Cor. xi. 18 πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ συνερχομένων ὑμῶν etc., ἔπειτα δέ is probably implied in vs. 20 ff.; and Paul properly meant to write: In the first place, I hear that when ye come together there are divisions among you, and further, that irregularities occur at the Lord's Supper. Paul conceives the latter from a different point of view than the divisions. Rom. iii. 2 Tholuck has already correctly explained.

Likewise in Matt. viii. 21 ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι etc.
509 there is nothing corresponding to πρῶτον; yet we, too, say: let me *first*
6th ed. (*in the first place*) go and bury, — whereupon every one readily supplies according to the context: I will then return (and follow thee, vss. 19, 22). When in the combination τε ... καί a πρῶτον is inserted after τε, as in Rom. i. 16; ii. 9 f., it means *especially, chiefly*. In 2 Cor. viii. 5, too,
599 πρῶτον ... καί does not stand for πρῶτον ... ἔπειτα; see Mey.

An anacoluthon similar to that with μέν occurs sometimes with καί where it ought to have been repeated (*as well ... as also*). Thus in 1 Cor. vii. 38 ὥστε καὶ ὁ ἐκγαμίζων καλῶς ποιεῖ, ὁ δὲ μὴ ἐκγαμίζων κρεῖσσον ποιεῖ the sentence is strictly speaking so laid out that καὶ ὁ μὴ ... καλῶς ποιεῖ ought to follow. But Paul, while intending to express himself thus, corrects himself and employs the comparative, and then the adversative particle appears more appropriate. There is, however, weighty evidence against δέ; and

it may have been introduced by transcribers for the reason just mentioned, instead of the original καί.

II. 1. Different from anacoluthon is the *oratio variata* (Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 22; Jacobs, Aelian. p. 6; Bremi, Aeschin. II. 7; Mtth. 1530 ff.). It takes place when, in parallel sentences and members of sentences, two (synonymous) constructions have been adopted, each of which is complete in itself — *heterogeneous* structure. It occurs in accurate writers particularly when the continuance of the previous construction would have been heavy, obscure, or not quite suited to the thought (Engelhardt, Plat. Menex. 254; Beier, Cic. off. II. 38); sometimes, also, regard for variety of expression has had influence.

We subjoin, in the first place, some instances of a simple description: 1 Jno. ii. 2 ἱλασμὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου (where, either instead of the last words the writer might have used περὶ τῶν ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου, or instead of the first, περὶ ἡμῶν), similar 537
are Heb. ix. 7; Acts xx. 34 (1 Kings iii. 1; iv. 30; Lucian. parasit. 7th ed.
20); Eph. v. 33 καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἕνα ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπάτω ὡς ἑαυτόν, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φόβηται τὸν ἄνδρα (cf. § 43, 5, and Jno. xiii. 29); Eph. v. 27 ἵνα παραστήσῃ ἑαυτῷ ἔνδοξον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, μὴ ἔχουσαν σπῖλον . . . ἀλλ' ἵνα ᾖ (ἡ ἐκκλησία) ἁγία κ. ἄμωμος,[1] cf. Acta apocr. p. 179; Phil. ii. 22 ὅτι, ὡς πατρὶ τέκνον, σὺν ἐμοὶ ἐδούλευσεν εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον that, as a child a father, he served (me in my apostolic calling, more appositely) with me etc., Rom. iv. 12 (Ael. an. 2, 42); Luke ix. 1; i. 73 f.[2]; Rom. i. 12; cf. Mtth. 1529 f.; Schwarz, soloec. p. 89 sq.; 1 Cor. xiv. 1 ζηλοῦτε τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε (where Paul might have written τὸ προφητεύειν), cf. vs. 5 and vs. 11; Rev. iii. 18; 600
Acts xxii. 17.

The following are bolder: Mark xii. 38 f. τῶν θελόντων ἐν στολαῖς περιπατεῖν καὶ ἀσπασμοὺς (ἀσπάζεσθαι) ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς etc.; 510
Jno. viii. 53 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις 6th ed.
ἀπέθανε; καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον, where the regular construction required the continuation of the interrogative form: καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, οἵτινες ἀπέθ.; 1 Cor. vii. 13 γυνή, ἥτις ἔχει ἄνδρα

[1] Jno. xi. 52 (ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν) οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὰ τέκνα . . . συναγάγῃ εἰς ἕν does not come under this head. There was here no more convenient mode of expression for the second clause.

[2] On the other hand, in Luke i. 55 the words τῷ Ἀβραάμ etc. belong to μνησθῆναι ἐλέους, especially on account of εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

ἄπιστον καὶ οὗτος συνευδοκεῖ (καὶ συνευδοκοῦντα) οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτῆς, μὴ ἀφιέτω αὐτόν, see above, p. 150 ; cf. similar instances in Luke xvii. 31 and Jno. xv. 5. In Rom. xii. 6 sq. ἔχοντες δὲ χαρίσματα κατὰ τὴν χάριν . . . εἴτε προφητείαν κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, εἴτε διακονιαν ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ διδάσκων ἐν τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, εἴτε ὁ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῇ παρακλήσει the construction (Acc. governed by ἔχοντες) is kept up only as far as ἐν τῇ διακ., then commences a new construction with concretes, for which Paul might have written εἴτε διδασκαλίαν . . . παράκλησιν etc. In 2 Cor. xi. 23 ff. Paul enumerates the sufferings attendant on the apostolic calling, by which he had proved himself to be the servant of Christ, and that in no ordinary degree. First, ἐν κόποις περισσοτ. etc. is simply appended, each particular is enhanced by an adverb of degree, then follow narrative Aorists and Perfects vs. 24 f. ; Paul then returns to substantives with the instrumental Dative and the instrumental ἐν by turns, vss. 26, 27. See, further, Jno. v. 44 ; Phil. i. 23 f. ; 1 Jno. iii. 24.

The alteration in the construction is manifestly intentional; namely, for the purpose of bringing out the thought more forcibly than would have been done by a uniform structure, in 2 Jno. 2 διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τὴν μένουσαν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.[1] Also in Rom. ii. 9 sq. the first time (in reference to
538 misery) ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ψυχήν is used, the second time (in reference
7th ed. to salvation) the more appropriate personal Dative. The oratio variata occurs in connection with an ellipsis, in 2 Cor. viii. 23 ; Rom. ii. 8 ; xi. 22 and Mark vi. 8 παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδόν . . . ἀλλ' ὑποδεδεμένους σανδάλια (sc. πορεύ-
601 εσθαι) καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσασθαι (here ἐνδύσησθε is the better reading) δύο χιτῶνας, see Fr. in loc. In Rom. xii. 2 we should probably read the Inf. συσχηματίζεσθαι, and not the Imperat. συσχηματίζεσθε.

[1] Mark ii. 23 can hardly, with *Fr.*, be brought under the head of variatio structurae, if measured by the standard of cultivated prose : ἐγένετο παραπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν . . . διὰ τῶν σπορίμων, καὶ ἤρξαντο οἱ μαθηταί etc. for ἄρξασθαι τοὺς μαθητάς. The latter construction would be too heavy for the narrative style of the Evangelists. Besides, ἐγένετο stands in no necessary relation to ἄρξασθαι τοὺς μαθ. (as if, it came to pass that, as he . . . , the disciples plucked ears) ; but Mark meant : It came to pass, that he went through the grain fields *on the Sabbath-day*, and (then) the disciples plucked etc. Still less can I perceive in 1 Cor. iv. 14 ; Eph. ii. 11–13 or even in Phil. i. 13 any remarkable alteration of the construction. No writer expresses himself with such painful nicety as never to say, *I write not these things to shame you, but as my beloved children I warn you*, instead of, *not to shame you . . . but . . . to warn*. But in Acts xxi. 28 (*Fr.* conject. I. 42 sq.) ἔτι τε shows that Luke wished to give prominence to what follows, and hence the independent construction of this new clause.

From Greek authors many similar instances might be adduced. Thus Paus. 1, 19, 5 *τοῦ Νίσου λέγεται θυγατέρα ἐρασθῆναι Μίνω καὶ ὡς ἀπέκειρε τὰς τρίχας τοῦ πατρός*, 5, 1, 2; 8, 22, 4 *Πείσανδρος δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Καμιρεὺς ἀποκτεῖναι τὰς ὄρνιθας οὐ φησίν, ἀλλὰ ὡς ψόφῳ κροτάλων ἐκδιώξειεν αὐτάς*. Thuc. 8, 78; Xen. M. 2, 7, 8; Hell. 2, 3, 19; Anab. 2, 5, 5; Aelian. anim. 10, 13. As to Mark xii. 38 f. cf. especially Lys. caed. Eratosth. 21. From the Sept. may be quoted Gen. xxxi. 33; Judg. xvi. 24; 3 Esdras iv. 48; viii. 22, 80; Neh. x. 30. In Mark iii. 14 ff., with the principal words *ἐποίησε* 6th ed. *δώδεκα, ἵνα* etc. vss. 14, 15, which are complete in themselves, is connected first the detached statement vs. 16 *καὶ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα τῷ Σίμωνι* etc. in reference to the chief apostle, then follow in vss. 17–19 the names of the rest in direct dependence on *ἐποίησεν*, and only in vs. 17 is subjoined a similar statement, which no more breaks the flow of the discourse than in vs. 19 *ὃς καὶ παρέδωκεν* etc. does. The whole structure would be regular had Mark said in vs. 16 *Σίμωνα, ᾧ ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα* etc. 511

Under this head comes also the transition from a relative construction to a personal, as in 1 Cor. viii. 6 *εἷς θεὸς ... ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν*, 2 Pet. ii. 3 *οἷς τὸ κρίμα ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἀργεῖ καὶ ἡ ἀπώλεια αὐτῶν οὐ νυστάζει*, Rev. ii. 18, see above, p. 149; Weber, Demosth. p. 355 sq. Essentially similar is Luke x. 8 *εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν εἰσέρχησθε, καὶ δέχωνται* (*οἱ πολῖται*) *ὑμᾶς* etc.

On Rev. vii. 9 *εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος ... ἑστῶτες ... περιβεβλημένους*, cf. xiv. 14, see above, § 59, 11 p. 535. Both passages contain a blending of two constructions, as in Rev. xviii. 12 f., where are appended to *τὸν γόμον* first appositive Genitives, then an Acc. (*πᾶν ξύλον*), afterwards (*κ. ἵππων* etc.) Genitives again, lastly (*ψυχὰς ἀνθρ.*) another Acc. On the other hand, in ii. 17, in accordance with the proper distinction of cases, first a Gen. and then an Acc. are made to depend on *δώσω*. 539 7th ed.

2. Moreover, the transition (very frequent in Greek prose authors) from the oratio obliqua to the recta, and vice versa, deserves special attention (d'Orville, Charit. p. 89 and 347; Heind. Protag. p. 510 sq.; Jacobs, Aelian. p. 46, 475; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 160; Held, Plutarch. Timol. p. 451; Bornem. Xen. Mem. p. 253; Fr. Marc. p. 212): Acts xxiii. 22 *ἀπέλυσε τὸν νεανίαν παραγγείλας μηδενὶ ἐκλαλῆσαι, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐνεφάνισας πρός με*, vss. 23, 24 *εἶπεν· ἑτοιμάσατε ... κτήνη τε παραστῆσαι*, Luke v. 14 *παρήγγειλεν αὐτῷ* 602 *μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀπελθὼν δεῖξον*, Mark vi. 9; cf. Xen. Hell. 2, 1, 25; An. 1, 3, 14 and the passages from Joseph. in Kypke I. 229 sq.; Mark xi. 31 sq. *ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διατί οὖν*

οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ ; ἀλλ᾽ εἴπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ; ἐφοβοῦντο τὸν λαόν (where the narrator proceeds in his own words). With Acts i. 4 cf. Lysias in Diogit. 12 ἐπειδὴ δὲ συνήλθομεν, ἤρετο αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή, τίνα ποτὲ ψυχὴν ἔχων ἀξιοῖ περὶ τῶν παιδων τοιαύτῃ γνώμῃ χρῆσθαι, ἀδελφὸς μὲν ὢν τοῦ πατρός, πατὴρ δ᾽ ἐμός etc. (Geopon. 1, 12, 6). See also Jno. xiii. 29 ; Acts xvii. 3 ; on the other hand, in Matt. ix. 6 the narrator intercalates τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ among the words of Christ, cf. Mark ii. 10 ; Luke v. 24. This explanation is the simplest. Meyer is artificial.[1]

512 6th ed. A transition from the Sing. to the Plur., and vice versa, occurs in Rom. iii. 7 f. ; xii. 16 ff. 20 ; 1 Cor. iv. (2) 6 f. (Aelian. 5, 8) ; 2 Cor. xi. 6 ; Jas. ii. 16 ; Gal. iv. 6 f. (vi. 1) ; Schweigh. Arrian. Epict. II. I. 94, 278 ; Matthiae, Eurip. Orest. 111 ; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 106 ; Schwarz, soloec. 107. Likewise Rom. ii. 15 ἐν τ. καρδίαις αὐτῶν, συμμαρτυρούσης αὐτῶν τῆς συνειδήσεως may be referred to this head. The transition from the Sing. to the Plur. in Luke v. 4 is intentional, see Bornem. in loc. As to the Plur. in apposition with a Sing. in 1 Jno. v. 16 see § 59, 8 p. 530.

A heterogeneous appositive construction occurs in Rev. i. 6 ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ, see § 59, 8. So also in other constructions the Greek authors sometimes place concretes and abstracts in juxtaposition, see Bremi, Aeschin. Ctesiph. § 25 ; Weber, Demosth. 260. Cf. also Caes. civ. 3, 32 erat plena *lictorum* et *imperiorum* provincia.

540 7th ed. 603

§ 64. DEFECTIVE STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES ; ELLIPSIS,[2] APOSIOPESIS.

I. The erroneous and variable notions about Ellipsis (and Pleonasm) current until very recently, and derived from the uncritical compilations of L. Bos[3] and his followers (cf. Haab p. 276 ff.), and of N. T. philologists in particular, were first cor-

[1] Matt. xvi. 11 πῶς οὐ νοεῖτε, ὅτι οὐ περὶ ἄρτων εἶπον ὑμῖν· προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ζύμης τῶν Φαρισαίων etc. is of a different sort, as here only the direct words of Jesus, used in vs. 6, are as such repeated. Likewise Jno. x. 36 contains nothing remarkable.

[2] See *K. F. Krumbholz*, de ellips. in N. T. usu freq. in his operar. subseciv. lib. 1. Norimb. 1736. 8vo. no. 11 ; *F. A. Wolf*, de agnitione ellipseos in interpretatione libror. sacror. Comment. I.–XI. Lips. 1800–1808. 4to. (Comm. I.–VI. have been reprinted in *Pott*, Sylloge commentt. theol. IV. 107 sqq. ; VII. 52 sqq. ; VIII. 1 sqq.), an uncritical collection. Cf. besides, *Bauer*, Philol. Thucyd. Paull. 162 sqq. ; *Bloch*, on the Ellipses in Paul's Epistles, in his Theologian Part I. (Odensee 1791).

[3] *Lamb. Bos*, Ellipses graecae. Franecq. 1712. 8vo. ; Traj. ad Rh. 1755. 8vo. ; ed. *C. Schoettgen*, 1713, 1728. 12mo. ; ed. *J. F. Leisner*, Lips. 1749, 1767. 8vo. ; ed *N. Schwebel*, Norimb. 1763 ; c. nott. *C. B. Michaelis*, Hal. 1765. 8vo. ; c. prior. editor. suisq. observatt. ed. *G. H. Schaefer*, Lips. 1808. 8vo. (reprinted at Oxford 1813. 8vo.), cf. *Fischer*, Weller. III. I. 119 sqq. ; III. II. 29 sqq.

rected, and sound views established, by Herm. de ellipsi et pleonasmo in Wolf and Buttmann's Mus. antiq. studior. Vol. I. fasc. I. pp. 97–235, and in Herm. Opusc. I. 148–244, and especially in his notes on Vig. 869 sqq.[1] We shall mainly follow him in this dis- 513
cussion, which, however, is primarily intended merely to lay down 6th ed.
the various classes of ellipses, since Glassius and Haab have already accumulated examples in great abundance.[2]

1. Ellipsis (not including Aposiopesis, to be treated under No. II) consists in the omission of a word the meaning of which must be supplied in thought (in order to complete the sentence).[3] The omission of such a word (whether out of convenience or an effort to be concise)[4] is allowable only when, in what is uttered, an 604
indubitable intimation of the omitted word is given (Hm. opusc. p. 218), either by means of the particular structure of the sentence 541
or by virtue of a conventional usage.[5] In accordance with the 7th ed.
three constituent parts of every simple sentence, such omissions may be arranged under the three main classes of Ellipses of the Subject, of the Predicate, and of the Copula (Hm. Vig. 870 sq.). A real i.e. entire ellipsis of the *predicate*, however, does not, and probably cannot, occur (Hm. Vig. 872), since the possible predicates are too various for the speaker to leave this part of his sentence to be supplied by the reader. Accordingly there remain but the other two sorts of ellipses, and those of the subject are naturally the more limited.

The case in which a word or phrase of a preceding clause must be repeated in a subsequent connected clause, either unchanged or altered to suit the construction (Glass. I. 632 sqq.), cannot be called an ellipsis, there being here no actual omission of the word (Hm. Vig. 869; Opusc. 151 sq.; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 282).[6] Examples:

[1] Ellipsis in Latin is discussed by *J. W. Schlickeisen*, de formis linguae latinae ellipticis. Mühlhausen, 1830 and 43. two Pr. 4to. An earlier work of *J. G. Lindner* on Latin Ellipses (Frkft. a. M. 1780. 8vo.) is of little value even as a collection of examples.

[2] How much the books of Scripture have been compelled to suffer from expositors in the matter of Ellipsis *Hm.* Opusc. p. 217 intimates, when he terms these books, cereos flecti quorundam artibus.

[3] *Hm.* opusc. p. 153: ellipseos propria est ratio grammatica, quae posita est in eo, ut oratio, etiamsi aliquid omissum sit, integra esse censeatur, quia id, quod omissum est, necessario tamen intelligi debeat, ut quo non intellecto sententia nulla futura sit.

[4] The omission of a word may also sometimes arise entirely or partly from a rhetorical cause. See below, no. 3.

[5] Neither of these can, for instance, be shown by those expositors who, to get over the historical difficulty in Jno. xviii. 31, would supply *hoc die* (festo) in connection with ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα.

[6] It must not be overlooked that this mode of expression gives style greater periodic

a. 2 Cor. i. 6 εἴτε θλιβόμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν σωτηρίας sc. θλιβόμεθα (v. 13; vii. 12); Luke xxii. 36 ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον, ἀράτω ... ὁ μὴ ἔχων sc. βαλλάντιον (κ. πήραν), Jas. ii. 10; Jno. iv. 26; xii. 28 δόξασον σοῦ τὸ ὄνομα ... καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω sc. τὸ ὄνομά μου. Cf. also Rom. iii. 27; viii. 4; xi. 6; xiii. 1 (αἱ δὲ οὖσαι sc. ἐξουσίαι, which but few authorities add),[1] Jno. iv. 53; Acts xxiii. 34; 1 Cor. vii. 3 f.; xi. 25 (cf. vs. 23); xv. 27; 2 Cor. xi. 11; Rev. ii. 9. So especially in answers: Jno. xviii. 5 τίνα ζητεῖτε; ...
514 Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον, vs. 7; Luke xx. 24 τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν;
6th ed. ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· Καίσαρος, vii. 43; Matt. xxvii. 21; Heb. v. 4 οὐχ ἑαυτῷ τις λαμβάνει τὴν τιμήν, ἀλλὰ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τ. θεοῦ sc. λαμβάνει τ. τιμ. (but λαμβ. in the sense of *receive*).

605 b. Mark xiv. 29 εἰ πάντες σκανδαλισθήσονται, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγώ (σκανδαλισθήσομαι, cf. Matt. xxvi. 33); Eph. v. 24 ὥσπερ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑποτάσσεται τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω ... αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἀνδράσιν (ὑποτασσέσθωσαν); 2 Tim. i. 5 ἥτις ἐνῴκησεν ἐν τῇ μάμμῃ σου ... πέπεισμαι δέ, ὅτι καὶ ἐν σοί (ἐνοικεῖ); Rom. xi. 16 εἰ ἡ ἀπαρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φύραμα (ἅγιον); Heb. v. 5 ὁ Χρ. οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν ... ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτὸν (ἐδόξ. αὐτόν); 1 Cor. xi. 1 μιμηταί
542 μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς κἀγὼ Χριστοῦ (μιμητής εἰμι); xiv. 27 εἴτε γλώσσῃ τις
7th ed. λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο ἢ τὸ πλεῖστον τρεῖς (λαλείτωσαν), cf. 1 Pet. iv. 11; Luke xxiii. 41 ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ· καὶ ἡμεῖς μὲν δικαίως (ἐσμέν sc. ἐν τῷ κρίματι τούτῳ); 1 Cor. ix. 12, 25; xi. 16; 2 Cor. iii. 13 καὶ οὐ καθάπερ Μωϋσῆς ἐτίθει κάλυμμα ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον ἑαυτοῦ (τίθεμεν καλ. ἐπὶ τὸ πρ. ἡμῶν),[2] cf. besides Matt. xx. 23; xxvi. 5; Jno. xiii. 9; xv. 4, 5; xvii. 22; xviii. 40; Rom. i. 21; ix. 32; xiv. 23; Phil. ii. 5; iii. 4; Heb. (ii. 13) v. 5; x. 25; xii. 25; Rev. xix. 10; Matt. xxv. 9. Under this head comes also 1 Cor. vii. 21 δοῦλος ἐκλήθης, μή σοι μελέτω, if, as is most natural, τῆς δουλείας be supplied (Lob. paralip. p. 314); see Meyer, who has overlooked the fact that even in my fifth edition I made this suggestion. The greatest accumulation of such indispensable repetitions occurs in Rom. xii. 6 ff.

c. Neither is there any real ellipsis when an affirmative word is to be supplied from a foregoing negative, — a case of frequent occurrence in Greek authors (e.g. Thuc. 2, 98, 3 πορευομένῳ αὐτῷ ἀπεγίγνετο μὲν οὐδὲν

compactness; whereas the repetition of the same or a similar expression would in most cases be very heavy.

[1] 1 Jno. iii. 20 also would, according to *Lücke's* exposition, come under this head, as γινώσκομεν (οἴδαμεν) is supplied before the second ὅτι, vs. 19. I confess, however, that to me this explanation seems very forced. Why might not a transcriber have added, from inadvertence, a second ὅτι? Lchm. has with A rejected the second ὅτι. But it may just as well have been omitted because it was not understood. Or why may not the author himself have repeated the ὅτι, as in Eph. ii. 11 f.? see *Fr.* Progr. ad Gal. p. 5 (*Fritzschiorum* opusc. p. 236). The passage has never yet been satisfactorily explained.

[2] This case, in which the verb is construed, not with the principal subject, but with the subject of the secondary clause, may be regarded as a sort of attraction, see *Krüger*, gramm. Untersuch. III. 72, who at the same time adduces many similar examples, as Xen. C. 4, 1, 3; Thuc. 1, 82; 3, 67.

τοῦ στρατοῦ εἰ μή τι νόσῳ, προσεγίγνετο δέ, see Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 78; sympos. p. 80, and Euthyd. p. 158; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 176, on the Lat. cf. Bremi, Nep. p. 345; Kritz, Sallust. II. 573); as, 1 Cor. vii. 19 ἡ περιτομὴ οὐδέν ἐστι, ἀλλὰ τήρησις ἐντολῶν θεοῦ (ἐστί τι or τὰ πάντα ἐστί), iii. 7; 1 Cor. x. 24 μηδεὶς τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητείτω, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου sc. ἕκαστος. Otherwise in Eph. iv. 29; 1 Cor. iii. 1. Frugality of expression is carried still farther in Mark xii. 5 καὶ πολλοὺς ἄλλους, τοὺς μὲν δέροντες, τοὺς δὲ ἀποκτείνοντες, where from these two Participles a finite verb is to be borrowed that combines both verbal notions, — such as *maltreat* (cf. Fr. in loc.). Also in Rom. xiv. 21 καλὸν τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν κρέα μηδὲ πιεῖν οἶνον, μηδὲ ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἀδελφός σου προσκόπτει etc., after the second μηδέ, the general word ποιεῖν (Aristot. Nicom. 8, 13, 6), or such an expression as *make use of*, is probably to be supplied. As to Phil. ii. 3 see below, p. 587 (Lob. paralip. p. 382). In Heb. x. 6, 8 ὁλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ εὐδόκησας the general notion θυσίας is to be educed from ὁλοκ. for περὶ ἁμ., as in Heb. x. 38 the general term ἄνθρωπος is to be gathered from δίκαιος (cf. Kühner II. 37). In Rev. vi. 4 we must abstract from λαβ. τ. εἰρ. ἐκ τῆς γῆς the concrete οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπ' αὐτῆς as a subject for σφάξουσι. Yet here, too, the omission is but partial. (For examples of all the preceding cases from Latin, see Lindner, lat. Ellips. S. 240 ff.) At the same time, in all these cases the incompleteness of the sentence (viewed grammatically and logically) renders it obviously necessary to supply something. This is not the case in Jno. viii. 15 ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν σάρκα κρίνετε, ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω οὐδένα, where on the contrary the second clause is so concluded by οὐδένα that nothing whatever requires to be supplied: *ye judge according to the flesh, but I judge no one* (not merely, no one according to the flesh, but absolutely no one). To supply κατὰ τὴν σάρκα from the foregoing clause could only be justified by incongruity in the sense without such addition. This, however, I am as unable to discover as Olshausen and Lücke. On the meaning, see especially BCrus. in loc.

515 6th ed. 606 543 7th ed.

After εἰ δὲ μή or εἰ δὲ μή γε (Matt. vi. 1; Luke x. 6; xiii. 9; 2 Cor. xi. 16 etc.; cf. Plat. Gorg. 503 c.; Phaed. 63 c.; Hoogeveen, partic. gr. I. 345 sq.), and after the expression (current with Paul) οὐ μόνον δέ (... ἀλλὰ καί), it is peculiarly common to supply a preceding word or phrase; as, Rom. v. 3 οὐ μόνον δέ (sc. καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης vs. 2), ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα etc., v. 11 καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ... οὐ μόνον δέ (καταλλαγέντες σωθησ.), ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι, viii. 23; 2 Cor. viii. 19. In Rom. ix. 10 οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ Ῥεβέκκα etc. something to be gathered from a more distant part of the context appears to be wanting. It is easiest to supply it from vs. 9; cf. vs. 12: *and* (not only) *Sarah received a divine promise respecting her son*, but also Rebecca, who was yet the mother of two legitimate sons, etc. In Greek cf. Diog. L. 9, 39 πεντακοσίοις ταλάντοις τιμηθῆναι, μὴ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαλκαῖς εἰκόσι. Lucian. vit. auct. 7 οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἦν θυρωρεῖν αὐτὸν ἐπιστήσῃς, πολὺ

πιστοτέρῳ χρήσῃ τῶν κυνῶν, Toxar. 1 (Kypke, obs. II. 165; Hoogeveen, partic. II. 956). Analogous is the expression οὐ μόνον γε ... ἀλλά used by earlier authors, e.g. Plat. Phaed. 107 b. οὐ μόνον γ', ἔφη ὁ Σωκράτης (sc. ἀπιστίαν σε δεῖ ἔχειν περὶ τῶν εἰρημένων), ἀλλὰ ταῦτά τε εὖ λέγεις etc., Meno 71 b.; legg. 6, 752 etc., see Heind. and Stallb. Plat. Phaed. as above. The clause after οὐ μόνον δέ is (by repetition) expressed in 2 Cor. vii. 7. Also the use of κἄν, in the sense of *vel certe* (Vig. 527; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 97), is referable to an omission, e.g. Mark vi. 56 ἵνα κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου ... ἄψωνται (properly ἵνα ἅψωνται αὐτοῦ, κἂν τοῦ κρασπέδου ἅψωνται), 2 Cor. xi. 16, as also εἰ καί in 2 Cor. vii. 8 cf. Bengel in loc.

Still less is it to be considered as an ellipsis when, in one and the same principal clause, a word used only once is to be supplied twice (in different phrases): Acts xvii. 2 κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς τῷ Παύλῳ εἰσῆλθε πρὸς αὐτούς (Παῦλος), xiii. 3 ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν (αὐτούς). In Rom. ii. 28 οὐχ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ περιτομή the predicative Ἰουδαῖος and περιτομή must be supplied also to the subject ὁ ἐν τῷ φαν. Cf. further Acts viii. 7.

607 Note. It may sometimes happen that a word is to be supplied in the preceding from the *subsequent* context (Hm. opusc. 151; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. p. 109; Lindner, lat. Ellips. S. 251 ff.), cf. 1 Cor. vii. 39. But in
516 Rom. v. 16 to supply παραπτώματος after ἐξ ἑνός from ἐκ τῶν πολλῶν παρα-
6th ed. πτωμάτων may now be regarded as out of date, see Philippi in loc. And in 2 Cor. viii. 5 ἔδωκαν serves, as usual, also for the clause beginning with καὶ οὐ, only with the latter it must be taken absolutely: *and they did not give as* (in extent) *we hoped, but their own selves gave they* etc. Only in Mark xv. 8 ἤρξατο αἰτεῖσθαι καθὼς ἀεὶ ἐποίει αὐτοῖς it may seem as if it were necessary to supply ποιεῖν after αἰτεῖσθαι, from ἐποίει; but the words
544 properly run: *to entreat according as he always did for them*, from which
7th ed. the object of request may be gathered, but not grammatically supplied. As to Eph. iv. 26, however, where some would supply μή from the second member also in the first, see p. 311.

2. The most frequent real omission is that of the simple copula εἶναι:

a. In the form ἐστί, more rarely in the form ᾖ (yet cf. Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 133), because it is obviously suggested by the juxtaposition of subject and predicate (Rost 473 f.; Krü. 240 f.; cf. Wannowski, syntax. anom. p. 210 sq.) Heb. v. 13 πᾶς ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ἄπειρος (ἐστὶ) λόγου δικαιοσύνης, ix. 16; x. 4, 18; xi. 19; Mark xiv. 36; Rom. xi. 16; xiv. 21; 2 Cor. i. 21; Phil. iv. 3; Eph. i. 18; iv. 4; v. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 2; 1 Pet. iv. 17, particularly in questions Luke iv. 36; Acts x. 21; Rom. iii. 1; viii. 27, 31; 2 Cor. ii. 16; vi. 14; Rev. xiii. 4; Heb. vi. 8 (cf. Kritz, Sallust. I. 251) and exclamations Acts xix. 28, 34 μεγάλη ἡ Ἄρτεμις

Ἐφεσίων, but especially in certain set forms of expression Jas. i. 12 *μακάριος ἀνήρ, ὅς* etc. (Matt. v. 3, 5–10; xiii. 16; Luke i. 45; Rom. iv. 8; xiv. 22; Rev. xvi. 15; cf. 1 Pet. iv. 14), *δῆλον ὅτι* 1 Cor. xv. 27; 1 Tim. vi. 7, *ἀνάγκη* with Infin. Heb. ix. 16, 23; Rom. xiii. 5, *πιστὸς ὁ θεός* 1 Cor. i. 9; x. 13; 2 Cor. i. 18 or *πιστὸς ὁ λόγος* 1 Tim. i. 15; iii. 1; 2 Tim. ii. 11, *ὁ κύριος ἐγγύς* Phil. iv. 5, *ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τ. τροφῆς* Matt. x. 10; 1 Tim. v. 18 cf. Rev. v. 2, *ἔτι μικρόν* Jno. xiv. 19, *μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον* Heb. x. 37, *εἰ δυνατόν* Matt. xxiv. 24; Rom. xii. 18; Gal. iv. 15, *ὥρα* with Infin. Rom. xiii. 11 (Plat. ap. p. 42), *τί γάρ* Phil. i. 18; Rom. iii. 3, *τί οὖν* Rom. iii. 9; vi. 15, *τί ἐμοὶ κ. σοί* Mark v. 7; i. 24; Luke viii. 28; Jno. ii. 4 (Her. 5, 33; Demosth. aphob. 564 b.; Arrian. Epict. 1, 1, 16; 2, 19, 16), *τί τὸ ὄφελος* 1 Cor. xv. 32; Jas. ii. 14, 16, *ᾧ ὄνομα* or *ὄνομα αὐτῷ*, where the name follows, Luke ii. 25; Jno. i. 6; iii. 1, etc. (Demosth. Zenoth. p. 576 b.), cf. besides Acts xiii. 11; ii. 29. In the latter, as in the former, brevity and compactness are in place, cf. Vig. p. 236.[1] The Subjunctive *ᾖ* is to 608
be supplied after *ἵνα* in (Rom. iv. 16) 2 Cor. viii. 11, 13.

b. More rarely is the substantive verb omitted in other forms: as *εἰμί* 2 Cor. xi. 6 *εἰ δὲ καὶ ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει* (*λογίζομαι μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπερλίαν ἀποστόλων* precedes),[2] *εἰσί* Rom. iv. 14; xi. 16; 1 Cor. xiii. 8; i. 26 (see Mey.); Rev. xxii. 15; Heb. ii. 11 (Schaef. melet. p. 43 sq.), *ἐσμέν* Rom. viii. 17; 517
2 Cor. x. 7; Phil. iii. 15 (Plin. epp. 6, 16), *εἶ* Rev. xv. 4 (Plat. 6th ed.
Gorg. 487 d.), *ἔστω* Rom. xii. 9; Col. iv. 6; Heb. xiii. 4, 5 (Fr. Rom. III. 65) also after *χάρις τῷ θεῷ* Rom. vi. 17; 2 Cor. viii. 16; ix. 15 (Xen. A. 3, 3, 14), *εἴη* in wishes Rom. i. 7; xv. 33; Jno. xx. 19, 21, 26; Matt. xxi. 9; Luke i. 28; Tit. iii. 15. Two different forms of this verb are omitted at the same time in Jno. xiv. 11 *ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί*, xvii. 23. In 545
narration the Aorist also is suppressed, e.g. 1 Cor. xvi. 9 (Xen. 7th ed.
An. 1, 2, 18; Cyr. 1, 6, 6; Thuc. 1, 138, etc.). On the Future see p. 586. In all cases in the simple diction of the N. T. it is easy (in Greek authors it is frequently more difficult, see Schaef. melet. p. 43 sq. 114) to perceive from the connection what words are to be supplied. Hitherto, however, expositors have been very lavish of their ellipses of the substantive verb, and have in par-

[1] Under this head comes also the phrase *τί (ἐστι) ὅτι* Mark ii. 16; Acts v. 4 (Bar. iii. 10); *Fr.* Mr. p. 60.

[2] More simply in Mark xii. 26 Sept. *ἐγὼ ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ* Acts vii. 32. Also 2 Cor. viii. 23. Cf. Soph. Antig. 634.

ticular transformed in this way a multitude of Participles into finite verbs, cf. § 45, 6 p. 350.

Likewise the Imperative plural ἐστέ[1] is, according to the whole tone of the sentence, omitted in passages such as Rom. xii. 9 (1 Pet. iii. 8); and to explain the Participle ἀποστυγοῦντες by an anacoluthon is unnecessary. With εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός etc. Rom. ix. 5; 2 Cor. i. 3; Eph. i. 3 we must supply, not ἐστί (Fr. Rom. I. 75), but (cf. 1 Kings x. 9; Job i. 21) εἴη or ἔστω.

Likewise, where ἐστί etc. is more than a mere copula, where it denotes *existence, permanence*, it is sometimes wanting (Rost 474) 1 Cor. xv. 21 δι' ἀνθρώπου ὁ θάνατος (exists) vs. 40; Rom. iv. 13.

It is thus sufficient to supply εἶναι or γίνεσθαι even in most of those passages where an oblique case or a preposition seems to require a more definite verb; as, 1 Cor. vi. 13 τὰ βρώματα τῇ κοιλίᾳ καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασι, Acts x. 15 φωνὴ πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου
609 πρὸς αὐτόν (ἐγένετο, cf. vs. 13), Matt. iii. 17 (Jno. xii. 28 ἦλθεν φωνή),[2] 1 Cor. iv. 20 οὐκ ἐν λόγῳ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐν δυνάμει (cf. ii. 5), Rom. x. 1; xi. 11; 2 Cor. iv. 15; viii. 13 (Mey.), 1 Pet. iii. 12; Heb. vii. 20. The preposition or case suggests the particular verbal notion to be supplied: (whose final doom) *leads to burning, is destined for, results in*, etc. As in the last passage ἐγένετο is obviously sufficient, so in the first and second, in accordance with the simplicity of the style, nothing more than ἐστί is to be supplied. The same applies to 1 Cor. v. 12 τί γάρ μοι καὶ τοὺς
518 ἔξω κρίνειν; (Arrian. Epict. 2, 17, 14 τί μοι νῦν τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους
6th ed. μάχην παραφέρειν; 4, 6, 33) and Jno. xxi. 22 τί πρός σε; (see Hm. opusc. p. 157 sq. 169; Bos, ellips. p. 598; cf. the Latin hoc nihil ad me, quid hoc ad me, Kritz, Sallust. II. 146). Also in
546 Jno. xxi. 21 οὗτος δὲ τί; ἔσται (γενήσεται) is sufficient. The
7th ed connection points to a Future. Cf. 1 Pet. iv. 17. Lastly, under this head comes the expression ἵνα τί sc. γένηται or γένοιτο, Hm. Vig. 849.

[1] *Mey.* thinks that ἐστέ is to be supplied also in Eph. i. 13 after ἐν ᾧ. But this ἐν ᾧ seems rather to be taken up again after the clause ἀκούσαντες etc. in the second ἐν ᾧ. For εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ can hardly be introduced between ἀκούσαντες and πιστεύσαντες.

[2] What is suppressed is always that which is the most simple; and although here and there in a phrase elsewhere elliptical a writer inserts a specific verb, it does not follow that this very verb is the verb to be supplied. Thus Antipater, in the Greek Anthology, says: εἴ τί τοι ἐκ βίβλων ἦλθεν ἐμῶν ὄφελος. Yet we must not on that account, with *Palairet* p. 415, supply ἦλθε in the phrase τί μοι τὸ ὄφελος, but merely the simple ἐστί. In the same way, in Lucian. merc. cond. 25 we find τί κοινὸν λύρᾳ καὶ ὄνῳ; but it does not follow from this that κοινόν must be supplied in the phrase τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; see *Fr.* Mr. p. 33.

Verbs which express the predicate (or a part of it) as well as the copula (Hm. p. 156 sq.) can be suppressed only when some intimation of them is given in the structure of the sentence (Bar. iv. 1). Cf. the familiar phrases *Twelve for a dollar*, manum de tabula, haec hactenus, etc. Thus in Acts ix. 6 rec. *ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν* it is easy to supply *εἶπε* (vs. 15), which is suggested in *πρὸς αὐτόν*, as in ii. 38; xxv. 22 (Aelian. 1, 16 var.).[1] In Rom. iv. 9 *ὁ μακαρισμὸς οὗτος ἐπὶ τὴν περιτομὴν ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀκροβυστίαν;* the meaning is obviously: *does it have reference to* etc.; yet we must supply, not *πίπτει* with Theophylact, but rather *λέγεται* (Fr. in loc.), cf. vs. 6 (*λέγειν εἴς τινα* Eurip. Iphig. T. 1180). Acts xviii. 6 *τὸ αἷμα ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ὑμῶν*, Matt. xxvii. 25 *τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς* (2 Sam. i. 16; Plato, Euthyd. 283 e.) sc. *ἐλθέτω* cf. Matt. xxiii. 35 (though *ἔστω* is sufficient).[2] In Rom. v. 18 *ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα* supply *ἀπέβη* impersonal: *res cessit, abiit in* etc., and in the following *οὕτω καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς* 610
δικαίωσιν ζωῆς, (according to vs. 19) *ἀποβήσεται* (Fr.), or rather *ἀπέβη* also (Mey.). In 2 Cor. ix. 7 *ἕκαστος, καθὼς προῄρηται τῇ καρδίᾳ, μὴ ἐκ λύπης*, supply *δότω*, suggested by the whole context. In Luke xxii. 26 *ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως*, the word *ποιήσετε*, inferred from *κυριεύουσιν* etc., is most naturally to be supplied; perhaps even *ἔσεσθε* might suffice. But in Phil. ii. 3 with *μηδὲν κατὰ ἐρίθειαν* it is enough to repeat *φρονοῦντες*. In Gal. ii. 9 *δεξιὰς ἔδωκαν ἐμοὶ καὶ Βαρνάβᾳ κοινωνίας, ἵνα ἡμεῖς μὲν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς τὴν περιτομήν*, since the passage relates to preachers of the gospel, we may readily supply *εὐαγγελιζώμεθα, εὐαγγελίζωνται* (2 Cor. x. 16, like *κηρύττειν εἴς τινα* 1 Thess. ii. 9), and not with Fr. and Mey. the less significant *πορευθῶμεν, πορευθῶσιν* etc. In Rev. vi. 6 the complement of the cry, *χοῖνιξ σίτου δηναρίου καὶ τρεῖς χοίνικες κριθῶν δηναρίου a measure of wheat for a denarion!* is as obviously suggested by the Genitive of price (p. 206), as in similar forms of expression with us. As to the epistolary forms of salutation in Rev. i. 4 *Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ*, Phil. i. 1 *Παῦλος πᾶσιν τοῖς ἁγίοις . . . τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις* 519
6.h ed.

[1] This ellipsis has a wide range in Greek and Latin, e.g. Charit. 6, 1 *ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οἱ ἄνδρες*, Val. Flacc. 5, 254 *vix ea*. Cf. also Cic. N. D. 2, 4, 11 augures rem ad Senatum, and many similar instances especially in the epistolary style, Cic. fam. 4, 8; 7, 9; Attic. 15, 8 and 17; 16, 9, particularly ad Attic.

[2] In Greek authors also, when similar imprecations occur, e.g. *ἐς κεφαλήν σοι* Aristoph. pac. 1063, *τραπέσθω* is usually supplied (see *Bos* p. 657 sq.), agreeably to Mosch. 4, 123; Phalar. ep. 128.

547 sc. *χαίρειν λέγει*, or Acts xxiii. 26 *Κλ. Λυσίας τῷ κρατίστῳ ἡγεμόνι*
7th ed. *Φήλικι χαίρειν* sc. *λέγει*, xv. 23; Jas. i. 1, see Fr. Rom. I. 22.

In the proverb 2 Pet. ii. 22 *ὗς λουσαμένη εἰς κύλισμα βορβόρου*, the requisite verb is implied in *εἰς*, and *ἐπιστρέψασα* may easily be supplied, conformably to what precedes. But it is precisely in proverbs, where brevity of expression is necessary, that specific verbs are (by conventional usage) suppressed, cf. *γλαῦξ' εἰς Ἀθήνας*, *fortuna fortes*, and Bhdy. p. 351. Grotefend, ausf. lat. Gramm. II. 397 f.; Zumpt, lat. Gramm. p. 610.

3. The *subject* is *wholly* wanting (Krü. 232) only,

a. When it is self-evident; because the predicate, owing to the nature of the case or to conventional usage, can refer to but *one* (definite) subject, e.g. *βροντᾷ* (*ὁ Ζεύς*), *σαλπίζει* (*ὁ σαλπιγκτής*), *ἀναγνώσεται* (Demosth. Mid. 386 b.) sc. scriba, see above, § 58, 9 p. 521 sq. From Jewish phraseology may be included under this head the formulas of quotation *λέγει* Heb. i. 7, *εἴρηκε* iv. 4, *φησί* viii. 5 (vii. 17 rec. *μαρτυρεῖ*), see above, § 58, 9 p. 522. As to Heb. xiii. 5 see Bleek.

b. When an expression is introduced the subject of which is at once supplied by every reader's knowledge or memory; as, Jno. vi. 31 *ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν* sc. *ὁ θεός*, 2 Cor. ix. 9 (Ps. cxii. 9); 1 Cor. xv. 27 (but in vs. 25 the subject is
611 *Χριστός*), Col. i. 19; Jno. xii. 40; xv. 25; Rom. ix. 18 f.; see v. Hengel, Cor. p. 120 sq. As to Jno. vii. 51 see p. 523. On 1 Tim. iii. 16 see a few lines below; and as to Matt. v. 38 see below, no. 6 Remark, p. 598.[1]

Nothing is omitted when the third person Plur. is used impersonally, as in Jno. xx. 2 *ἦραν τὸν κύριον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου* (cf. § 58, 9 p. 522); for the general subject, *people* or *men*, is properly speaking already contained in the person. See also Luke xii. 20 and Bornem. in loc. The same applies to the Gen. Absolute, as in Luke viii. 20 *ἀπηγγέλη αὐτῷ λεγόντων* i.e. *they saying*, cf. 1 Kings xii. 9; 1 Chron. xvii. 24; Thuc. 1, 3; Xen. C. 3, 3, 54; Diog. L. 6, 32; Doederlein, Soph. Oedip. Col. p. 393; Valcken. Herod. p. 414; Schaef. Demosth. V. 301.

In 1 Tim. iii. 16, according to the reading *ὅς*, the subject to the relative clauses that follow would be wanting, unless, with recent editors, we begin the apodosis with *ἐδικ.* But that is unadvisable on account of the parallelism. It is more likely that all these members are co-ordinate, and that the apostle took them from some hymn (as such were in use even in the

[1] Sometimes when the subject is omitted a rhetorical reason has influence, inasmuch as it is concealed out of disappointment and vexation. To this might perhaps be referred Rom. ix. 19 and 2 Pet. iii 4 (see *Gerhard*).

apostolic church), and suppressed the subject, familiar to every one, all the more readily because he was concerned here only with those predicates which involved the μυστήριον. (As to the simple αὐτός in reference to a well-known subject, see § 22, 3 p. 146.) On 1 Cor. vii. 36, see § 67, 1. 548 7th ed

Under a. come also Heb. xi. 12 διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἑνὸς ἐγεννήθησαν, where the term *children* (*descendants*) is readily supplied, and indeed is already implied in γεννᾶσθαι (cf. Gen. x. 21); and Rom. ix. 11 μήπω γὰρ γεννηθέντων μηδὲ πραξάντων, where, moreover, the notion of τέκνων or υἱῶν is sufficiently intimated in Ῥεβέκκα ἐξ ἑνὸς κοίτην ἔχουσα etc. vs. 10. In Luke xvi. 4 the subject is *the debtors*, cf. vs. 5. 520 6th ed.

When the subject is not omitted, but has to be repeated from the context (not Heb. viii. 4), there is room sometimes for a difference of opinion, as in Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. xv. 25 (Heb. ix. 1). The decision in such cases is not grammatical, but hermeneutical.

4. On the other hand, often but a part of the subject or of the predicate (if it consists of something besides the copula, see above, no. 2) is expressed, and the portion omitted is to be supplied from what is expressed in accordance with conventional usage; as, Acts xxi. 16 συνῆλθον καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν *there came also at the same time* (*some*, τινές) *of the disciples;* with ἐκ or ἀπό in Luke xi. 49 ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀποκτενοῦσι (τινάς), xxi. 16; Jno. xvi. 17; xxi. 10; vi. 39; 612
Rev. ii. 10 (v. 9); xi. 9,[1] cf. p. 203; Heindorf, Plat. Gorg. p. 148; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaestion. Lucian. 201; Jno. iv. 35 ὅτι ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστι (χρόνος), Xen. Hell. 2, 3, 9; Luke xii. 47 f. ἐκεῖνος ὁ δοῦλος ... δαρήσεται πολλάς ... ὀλίγας cf. 2 Cor. xi. 24. The notion of *stripes* is implied in δέρειν; accordingly πληγάς is readily suggested (and this elliptical phrase is of frequent occurrence in Greek authors, Xen. A. 5, 8, 12 τοῦτον ἀνέκραγον ὡς ὀλίγας παίσειεν, Aelian. anim. 10, 21 μαστιγοῦσι πολλαῖς, Aristoph. nub. 971; Schol. ad Thuc. 2, 39 (οἱ πλείονας ἐνεγκόντες), cf. Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 737; Ast, Plat. legg. p. 433; Valcken. ad Luc. l.c., and something similar in Bos under αἴκισμα, (cf. also the German: *er zählte ihm zwanzig auf, he counted him out twenty*).

The ellipsis is carried still further in 2 Cor. viii. 15 ὁ τὸ πολὺ οὐκ ἐπλεόνασε, καὶ ὁ τὸ ὀλίγον οὐκ ἠλαττόνησε (from Exod. xvi. 18 cf. vs. 17), where ἔχων may be supplied. Later writers employ this idiom (the Article with an Accusative) in various forms, e.g. Lucian. Catapl. 4 ὁ τὸ ξύλον, Bis Acc. 9 ὁ τὴν σύριγγα, dial. m. 10, 4 (Bhdy. 119), and it has been as fully sanctioned by usage in their case as in the case of the phrases specified above. See

[1] Some have infelicitously applied this ellipsis to Jno. iii. 25.

Bos, ellips. p. 166. Some expositors infelicitously apply it to Matt. iv. 15. In Rom. xiii. 7 *ἀπόδοτε πᾶσι τὰς ὀφειλάς, τῷ τὸν φόρον, τὸν φόρον* etc. the most natural ellipsis is *ἀποδιδόναι κελεύοντι* i.e. *ἀπαιτοῦντι*. In 1 Cor. iv. 6 *ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται*, if we reject *φρονεῖν* as spurious, an Infin. is wanting (per ellipsin, not as Mey. maintains [in his earlier eds.; but not so in the 4th.] per aposiopesin); it will be sufficient to supply the
549 general expression: *to go beyond* what etc., to exalt yourselves.
7th ed. On the other hand, in 1 Cor. x. 13 *ὑπὲρ ὃ δύνασθε* nothing is to be supplied; the verb is used absolutely, as *posse* often is in Latin. Luther correctly renders the passage: *über euer Vermögen*, (above that ye are able).

521 In 1 Pet. ii. 23 *παρεδίδου τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως* some supply *κρίσιν* from
6th ed. *κρίνοντι*, which in itself is not impossible; yet *παρεδίδου* probably is here, as often, to be taken reflexively: *he committed himself* (his cause) *to him that judgeth righteously*. There is no ellipsis whatever in Matt. xxiii. 9 *πατέρα μὴ καλέσητε ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, call not* (any man) *your father on the earth*, i.e. do not employ on the earth, i.e. among and of men, the appellation "our father;" and 1 Tim. v. 9 *χήρα καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἔλαττον ἐτῶν ἑξήκοντα γεγονυῖα* etc. is: *as a widow let no one be enrolled who is less than*
613 *sixty years of age;* widows entered on the list are, according to vs. 16, those who received support from the funds of the church.

5. It is common, in particular, to omit substantives in certain fixed phrases or in special contexts, and to express their adjectives merely, which latter of themselves conduct the mind to the substantives, cf. Bhdy. 183 ff. Examples:

ἡμέρα (Bos under the word) in the expressions, *ἡ ἑβδόμη* Heb. iv. 4 (of the Sabbath), *ἕως* or *μέχρι τῆς σήμερον* Matt. xxvii. 8; 2 Cor. iii. 15 (2 Chron. xxxv. 25; Malal. 12, 309, generally in the Sept. and the N. T. *ἡμέρας* is added), *ἡ αὔριον* Jas. iv. 14; Matt. vi. 34; Acts iv. 3, 5 (3 Macc. v. 38), *ἡ ἑξῆς* Acts xxi. 1; Luke vii. 11, *τῇ ἑχομένῃ* Luke xiii. 33; Acts xx. 15, *τῇ ἐπιούσῃ* Acts xvi. 11, *τῇ ἑτέρᾳ* (postridie) Acts xx. 15, *τῇ τρίτῃ* Luke xiii. 32 (Xen. C. 5, 3, 27; Plut. paedag. 9, 26 *τὴν μέσην τέμνειν*).[1]

ὁδός (Fischer as above, 259 sq.; Lob. paralip. p. 363): Luke xix. 4 *ἐκείνης ἤμελλε διέρχεσθαι*, v. 19 *μὴ εὑρόντες ποίας εἰσενέγκωσιν αὐτόν* (Cic. Att. 9, 1 qua ituri sint, Cic. divin. 1, 54, 123),[2]

[1] In Acts xix. 38 *ἀγόραιοι ἄγονται* (Strab. 13, 629) most expositors supply *ἡμέραι*, which is quite appropriate.

[2] The local meaning of the Gen. *that way* (cf. Germ. *des Wegs*) is questioned by *Bornem.* Luc. p. 37, 118, who wants to read in the two passages *ποίᾳ, ἐκείνῃ*; yet *Hm.*

iii. 5 *ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείας* etc. (where, however, in the second member *ὁδούς* follows) cf. Lucian. dial. m. 10, 13 *εὐθεῖαν ἐκείνην προϊόντες*, Paus. 8, 23, 2, Lat. compendiariâ ducere Senec. ep. 119, rectâ ire.[1]

ὕδωρ (Bos p. 501 sqq.): Matt. x. 42 *ὃς ἐὰν ποτίσῃ . . . ποτήριον ψυχροῦ*, Jas. iii. 11; Epict. ench. 29, 2; Arrian. Epict. 3, 12, 17 and 15, 3; Lucian. mors Peregr. 44, just as we say: *a glass of port, a bottle of sherry*, etc. We find also *θερμόν* sc. *ὕδωρ* Aristoph. nub. 1040; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 71, etc. So in Latin *frigida* Plin. ep. 6, 16, *calida* Tac. Germ. 22, *gelida* Hor. serm. 2, 7, 91. 550 ital. ed. 522 6th ed. 614

ἱμάτιον (Bos p. 204 sq.): Jno. xx. 12 *θεωρεῖ δύο ἀγγέλους ἐν λευκοῖς καθεζομένους in white* garments, Matt. xi. 8; Rev. xviii. 12, 16; cf. Sept. Exod. xxxiii. 4; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 10 *ἐν κοκκίνοις περιπατῶν* and Wetst. I. 381, 958; Bos p. 204.

γλῶσσα: Rev. ix. 11 *ἐν τῇ ἑλληνικῇ*.

ἄνρα (Bos p. 49; cf. Lob. paralip. p. 314): Acts xxvii. 40 *ἐπάραντες τὸν ἀρτέμονα τῇ πνεούσῃ* cf. Lucian. Hermot. 28, (similarly *τῷ πνέοντι* sc. *ἀνέμῳ* Lucian. Char. 3).

χώρα (Bos p. 560 sqq.): *ἐξ ἐναντίας ex adverso* Mark xv. 39, which is used likewise in a figurative sense Tit. ii. 8. The same word is usually supplied in Luke xvii. 24 *ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἡ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπ' οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει* (Sept. Job xviii. 4; Prov. viii. 28). *ἡ ὀρεινή* Luke i. 39 early became a substantive, *the highlands, the hill country*, Xen. Cyr. 1, 3, 3; Ptol. Geogr. 5, 17, 3; 6, 9, 4.

ὥρα time, is regarded as omitted in the phrase *ἀφ' ἧς* 2 Pet.

Vig. p. 881 found no fault with this local Gen. which became established in the Pronominal adverbs *οὗ, ποῦ*. And many instances of this very phrase *τῆς (αὐτῆς) ὁδοῦ* (cf. *Bhdy.* 138) are cited, and that not merely from poets (*Krü.* Sprachl. II. 2. S. 157); cf. in particular, Thuc. 4, 47, 2 and *Krü.* on the passage, and Thuc. 4, 33, 3. If any one wishes to bring this local Gen. nearer to the primary import of the Gen. (§ 30, 1), he may take it perhaps thus: *out* or *forth from that (way)*. But probably it connects itself more simply with the use mentioned in § 30, 11 p. 207.

[1] Many adverbial expressions arose from an ellipsis of *ὁδός* (Bttm. ausf. Sprachl. II. 341) or *χώρα* (Bos p. 561), such as *ἰδίᾳ, κατ' ἰδίαν, δημοσίᾳ* Acts xvi. 37 etc., which no longer suggest to the mind their origin, *Bhdy.* 185 f. Such an adverbial expression also is *ἀπὸ μιᾶς* Luke xiv. 18, which cannot be discovered in the literary language of the Greeks, but was probably current in the language of conversation. It is equivalent to *with one mind* (*ἐκ μιᾶς ψυχῆς* Dion. H. II. 1058) or *with one voice* (uno ore, *ἐκ μιᾶς φωνῆς* Herod. 1, 4, 21). *Wahl*, clav. p. 45, after *Camerar.* is too artifical. It is possible, moreover, that the Greeks did not understand any substantive at all originally, but employed the Feminine (as an abstract, *Ewald*, Heb. Gr. 645), just as independently as the Neuter, see *Schaef.* Bos p. 43 and the Review in the L. Lit. Zeit. 1825. no. 179; this, however, *Hm.* opusc. p. 162 will not admit.

iii. 4; Luke vii. 45; Acts xxiv. 11, which, indeed, had already become completely an adverb (cf. however, Matt. xv. 28). The same applies to ἐξ αὐτῆς Mark vi. 25; Acts x. 33 etc., which many write as one word, ἐξαυτῆς.

δόμος (or οἶκος) Acts ii. 27, 31 εἰς ᾅδου, cf. Bos p. 14; Vechner, Hellenol. p. 124 sq., but the best Codd. [Sin. also] give εἰς ᾅδην.

γῆ: Matt. xxiii. 15 ἡ ξηρά (opposed to ἡ θάλασσα) the *continent*, *dry land* (Kypke in loc.). The same substantive would have to be supplied in Heb. xi. 26 οἱ ἐν Αἰγύπτου θησαυροί (Lchm.). Cf. Her. 8, 3; Diod. S. 12, 34. But the reading οἱ Αἰγύπτου θησαυροί [which Cod. Sin. also gives] is better supported.

χείρ in ἡ δεξιά, ἡ ἀριστερά Matt. vi. 3 etc., δεξιὰν διδόναι Gal. ii. 9 (Xen. A. 1, 6, 6; 2, 5, 3), ἐν δεξιᾷ, ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιάν Eph. i. 20; Matt. xxvii. 29.

δραχμή: Acts xix. 19 εὗρον ἀργυρίου μυριάδας πέντε, as we say: *he is worth ten thousand*. Cf. Lucian. eun. 3 and 8; Achill. T. 5, 17. So also the names of measures are omitted Ruth iii. 15.

ὑετός: Jas. v. 7 μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ (καρπῷ), ἕως λάβῃ πρώϊμον καὶ ὄψιμον.

The ellipsis in all these expressions has been sanctioned by long
551 usage, and for that very reason is plain, especially in particular
7th ed. contexts, to all who are familiar with the language (cf. *he put*
615 *down red*, *he sat on the right*, *he came in a coach and six*). Other omissions are more special (peculiar to the usus loquendi of a city or community), e.g. προβατική (πύλη Neh. iii. 1) Jno. v. 2 (just as they say in Leipsic, to go out at the Grimma), yet see Bos under the word πύλη. Such also are οἱ δώδεκα, οἱ ἑπτά (διάκονοι) Acts xxi. 8; cf. in Greek οἱ τριάκοντα (τύραννοι).

523 To this head have been referred incorrectly many expressions and phrases
6th ed. in which an adjective or neuter pronoun is used independently without any ellipsis (Krü. S. 3), e.g. τὸ ἱερόν (which at an early period had become a substantive) *the temple*, τὸ διοπετές Acts xix. 35, τὸ σηρικόν Rev. xviii. 12, in biblical diction τὸ ἅγιον *the holy place* (in the tabernacle and the temple), τὸ ἱλαστήριον etc., τὰ ἴδια *one's own* (possession) Jno. i. 11, τὰ σά *what is thine* Luke vi. 30, τὰ κατώτερα τῆς γῆς Eph. iv. 9 (where, however, good Codd. [Sin. also] add μέρη), τὸ τρίτον τῶν κτισμάτων Rev. viii. 9 etc., and the adverbial expressions ἐν παντί, εἰς κενόν, τὸ λοιπόν (§ 54, 1). Likewise in Heb. xiii. 22 λόγων is not to be supplied after βραχέων, any more than *verbis* or the like is to be understood after *paucis*, or (in quotations) τόπῳ after ἐν ἑτέρῳ Acts xiii. 35; Heb. v. 6. Also in 1 Cor. xv. 46 τὸ πνευματικόν and τὸ ψυχικόν are used as substantives, and σῶμα is not to be understood. Lastly, with ἐν τῷ μεταξύ Jno. iv. 31 χρόνῳ is not to be supplied, but τῷ

μεταξύ is the Dat. of τὸ μεταξύ (Lucian. dial. d. 10, 1). Even the Gen. of *kindred*, such as Σώπατρος Πύῤῥου Acts xx. 4, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, Ἐμμὸρ τοῦ Συχέμ (§ 30, 3), is not elliptical, but the Gen. expresses the general notion of *belonging to*, just as we say: *Prussia's Blücher* (Hm. opusc. p. 120; Kühner II. 118 f.). For instances from Greek and Roman authors, see Vechner, Hellenol. p. 122 sq.; Jani, ars poet. p. 187 sq. But even were υἱός, ἀδελφός, and the like, actually omitted in such expressions, it would still be a complete perversion to supply υἱός before the Genitive in Gal. iii. 20 ὁ δὲ μεσίτης ἑνὸς οὐκ ἔστιν, (Kaiser de apologet. ev. Joa. consiliis II. 8). A word can be omitted only when the notion it expresses is conveyed by the context, or may be presumed to be known to the reader. But when it is said: the mediator is not of *one*, the expression does not even remotely intimate that precisely the word *son* is to be supplied. The sentence by itself merely means: *does not appertain to a single individual.* And that he appertains to him as *son* (instead of what surely must be regarded as most obvious, in his very function of mediator) is left wholly to conjecture!

On the other hand, a number of (transitive) verbs have, in a similar way, rid themselves in the course of time of the case of the noun in union with which they formed a current phrase, and are now used all alone to express the same meaning, e.g. διάγειν *to live* (in an ethical sense) Tit. iii. 3, strictly, to spend sc. τὸν βίον 552
1 Tim. ii. 2. So frequently in Greek authors, Xen. C. 1, 2, 2; 7th ed.
8, 3, 50; Diod. S. 1, 8. Similarly, διατρίβειν *sojourn* in a place 61
Jno. iii. 22, strictly, *spend* sc. τὸν χρόνον, see Kühnöl in loc. Cf. in Latin *agere*, *degere* (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 126 f.). Συμβάλλειν τινί or πρός τινα Acts iv. 15; xvii. 18 to *confer*, *consult with* one, originally συμβάλλειν λόγους *sermonem conferre* Ceb. 33; by the older Greeks chiefly in the Mid. συμβάλλεσθαι. Προσέχειν τινί *pay attention to* etc., sc. τὸν νοῦν, cf. in Latin *advertere*, *attendere*. Similar is ἐπέχειν Luke xiv. 7; Acts iii. 5. So perhaps also ἐνέχειν Mark vi. 19; Luke xi. 53, where, however, it is sometimes explained *to be angry*, supplying χόλον (Her. 1, 118; 6, 119); but no instance can be found of the suppression of *this* Acc. Ἐπι- 524
τιθέναι τινί (τὰς χεῖρας) Acts xviii. 10; cf. Xen. M. 2, 1, 15; Cyr. 6th ed.
6, 3, 6. Συλλαμβάνειν, concipere, *to become pregnant* Luke i. 31. Many verbs when used thus by themselves have become technical terms, as e.g. διακονεῖν Jno. xii. 2 *to serve* at table, προσφέρειν Heb. v. 3 *to offer*, προσκυνεῖν *to worship* Jno. xii. 20; Acts viii. 27, λατρεύειν Phil. iii. 3; Luke ii. 37; Acts xxvi. 7, καλεῖν *invite* 1 Cor. x. 27 (Xen. Cyr. 2, 2, 23; 8, 4, 1), κρούειν *knock* (at a door) Matt. vii. 7 etc., προβάλλειν *to put forth* (of trees), a

horticultural term, Luke xxi. 30. Nautical terms are *αἴρειν weigh* sc. *τὰς ἀγκύρας* Acts xxvii. 13 (Bos p. 15) Thuc. 2, 23, like the Latin *solvere* Caes. gall. 4, 23, and *κατέχειν εἰς* Acts xxvii. 40, see Wahl under the word.

We must, however, be careful not to refer to this head such verbs as either contain in themselves a complete notion, or in a given context are intended to express nothing more than the action which they denote, and are used absolutely, as *ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχειν to be pregnant*, *διορύσσειν to break through, to break in* Matt. vi. 19, *στρωννύειν ἑαυτῷ sibi sternere* Acts ix. 34 *to make one's bed*, *ἀποστέλλειν to send* (personally or by letter) Luke vii. 19; Acts xix. 31 (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 126), *μὴ ἔχειν to be poor* 1 Cor. xi. 22; Boisson. Philostr. epp. p. 128 (*habere* Jani, ars poët. p. 189), *ἀγοράζειν καὶ πωλεῖν* Rev. xiii. 17. [Just so in *ἀποκτενεῖτε* etc. Matt. xxiii. 34 the actions expressed are conceived absolutely; see Mey. ad loc.] For examples of verbs used abstractly, see e.g. 1 Cor. iii. 1; x. 13; Heb. xii. 25; Col. ii. 21; Phil. ii. 12; Jas. iv. 2 f. As to *πάσχειν* in particular, see Wahl, clav. p. 387; cf. Weber, Demosth. p. 384. Also Luke ix. 52 *ὥστε ἑτοιμάσαι αὐτῷ* is probably to be rendered: *to prepare for him*, what? appears from the context, and *ξενίαν* from Philem. 22 is not to be supplied. In the same way the verbs are used in 1 Cor. xi. 4 *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* (cf. 2 Cor. v. 12) and Rev. xxii. 19 *ἐάν τις ἀφέλῃ ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων τοῦ βιβλίου*, where to supply *τι* betrays an utter want of philological discernment. Lastly *δύνασθαι*, used absolutely, signifies *to be able*, have power, and does not require an Infin. to complete its sense, not even in 1 Cor. x. 13 (where *δύν. ὑπενεγκεῖν* follows immediately) cf. Rom. viii. 7; 1 Cor. iii. 2; 2 Cor. xiii. 8.
553 (Substantives with the Article are also used thus technically in
7th ed. doctrinal terminology, and with them a Gen. of the Person —
617 *θεοῦ* — has been looked for; as, *ἡ ὀργή* Rom. iii. 5; v. 9; xii. 19; 1 Thess. i. 10; ii. 16, *τὸ θέλημα* Rom. ii. 18.)

Adjectives used attributively with substantives can be omitted only in very rare instances. It is quite conceivable, for example, that in the phrase *λαλεῖν ἑτέραις* or *καιναῖς γλωσσαῖς* the adjective was dropped through frequent use, and that *γλωσσαῖς λαλεῖν* alone became a technical expression (de Wette on Acts, S. 33). But beyond the range of local and individual usage (somewhat like *libri*, namely Sibyllini, or *bishop in partibus* for in part. *infidelium*) nothing of this sort occurs; since, owing to the diversity of epithets that may be joined to a substantive, it would not do to leave the reader to guess the precise one to be supplied. In 2 Pet. ii. 10 *ὀπίσω σαρκὸς πορεύεσθαι* does not need to be completed by *ἑτέρας* from Jude 7;

the phrase is intelligible as it stands. In 1 Cor. vi. 20 ἠγοράσθητε τιμῆς the epithet μεγάλης is not omitted, but the words mean simply: *ye have been bought with a price;* the emphasis lies upon the verb *bought*, not obtained for nothing. In Matt. xii. 32 ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου we must not supply βλάσφημον; *to speak a word against* one, is a phrase complete in itself. In Rev. ii. 6, also, the rendering *hoc* (laudabile) *habes* does not assume the omission of some similar word in the Greek. A more plausible instance would be Acts v. 29 ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, i.e. οἱ ἄλλοι or λοιποὶ ἀπ. and the like; yet on this see above, § 58, 7 note, p. 520 sq.

It would be preposterous also to supply, for instance, ἕνα in Matt. xv. 23 525
οὐκ ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῇ λόγον or ἑνί in Luke vii. 7 εἰπὲ λόγῳ, or τινῶν in Mark 6th ed.
ii. 1 δι' ἡμερῶν (Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 440), or even πολύν in Luke xviii. 4 ἐπὶ χρόνον. The notion of *one* is contained in the Singular, and that of *several* in the Plural. Cf. Lucian. Herm. ταλάντου for *one talent*, and eun. 6 ἡμέραν unum diem (in Latin, ut verbo dicam), Lucian. Alex. 15 ἡμέρας οἴκοι ἔμεινεν, Xen. Eph. 5, 2; Charit. 5, 9. With Luke xviii. in particular, cf. the well-known χρόνῳ Schoem. Isae. p. 444.

Note. It would be the most absurd of all to admit the existence of an ellipsis of adverbs or conjunctions; and yet this has been done in a variety of cases by N. T. expositors. Of such interpreters Hm. opusc. p. 204 says: qui si cogitassent, adverbia conjunctionesque proprietatibus quibusdam et sententiarum inter se consociationibus ac dissociationibus indicandis inservire, quae nisi disertim verbis expressae vel propterea intelligi nequeant, quod, si ellipsi locus esset, etiam aliena intelligi possent: numquam adeo absonam opinionem essent amplexi, ut voculas, quarum omissio longe aliter quam adjectio sententias conformat, per ellipsin negligi potuisse crederent. But ignorance of the nature of the moods is in part at the bottom of this opinion. Thus with θέλεις εἴπωμεν Luke ix. 54; Heb. viii. 5, etc. some have wanted to supply a ἵνα or ὅπως, (see in opposition Hm. p. 207, cf. § 41, 4 b. p. 285); so also εἰ or ἐάν in sentences like 1 Cor. vii. 21 554
δοῦλος ἐκλήθης, μή σοι μελέτω (Hm. p. 205; cf. § 60, 4 c. p. 541); so ἄν 7th ed.
(Schwarz, soloec. p. 125) in Jno. xv. 22 εἰ μὴ ἦλθον ... ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον 618
and similar sentences (Hm. p. 205, see § 42, 2 p. 303 sq.); and so μόνον frequently in the expression οὐκ ... ἀλλά cf. § 55, 8 p. 495 sq. or 1 Cor. ix. 9.[1] It was likewise thought that ἤ was omitted after the comparative in Jno. xv. 13; 3 Jno. 4 (BCrus.), but the clauses with ἵνα in both passages

[1] Μὴ τῶν βοῶν μέλει τῷ θεῷ; Paul takes into view here only the spiritual sense of the law, and considers it from the same point as Philo, who says: οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀλόγων ὁ νόμος ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν νοῦν καὶ λόγον ἐχόντων, see *Mey.* The πάντων following ought to have deterred from such a weakening of the statement. In Rom. iv. 9, before ἢ καί *an etiam*, a μόνον is not required; and in iii. 28 μόνον, in the juxtaposition of πίστει and χωρὶς ἔργων νόμου (since in Paul's view πίστει and ἔργοις are mutually exclusive antitheses), would be quite superfluous, and would render the sentence cumbersome. On Rom. iv. 14, see *Fr.* in loc.

are added by way of explanation to the demonstrative pronoun, the Genitive of which is dependent on the comparative. Likewise in instances such as Acts iv. 22 ἐτῶν ἦν πλειόνων τεσσαράκοντα, xxiii. 13, 21; xxiv. 11; xxv. 6; Matt. xxvi. 53 ἤ is not to be supplied (though it is elsewhere used in such a construction). The Greeks had become accustomed to abbreviate the phrase in this manner, and probably did not regard the word πλείονες here as a comparative (more *than*), but as an annexed specification, just as elsewhere the neuter (adv.) πλέον is inserted even without government, see Lob. Phryn. p. 410 sq.; cf. Mtth. S. 1019. Lastly, some wanted (Pott still) in 2 Pet. iii. 4 ἀφ' ἧς οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως to supply ὡς before the last words, which would give an appropriate meaning indeed, but would be entirely
526 arbitrary. Two termini a quo are united here in a single sentence, one
6th ed. closer and one more remote, in so far, that is, as οἱ πατέρες is understood of those very fathers (see in particular Semler) who had received the promise of the παρουσία. (There would be a half ellipsis in a particle, if οὐ stood for οὔπω, cf. especially Withof, opusc. Ling. 1778. 8vo. p. 32 sqq. But in Jno. vi. 17 an οὔπω after the preceding ἤδη is to say the least unnecessary: *it had already become dark, and Jesus had not come.* In Jno. vii. 8 οὔπω is in fact only a correction; if we read οὐκ, we cannot remove the ethical difficulty of the passage by introducing a grammatical one in its place, (see also Boisson. Philostr. her. p. 502; Jacobs, Philostr. imagg. 357, and Aelian. anim. II. 250). It does not follow that οὐ is used for οὔπω in Mark vii. 18 because οὔπω occurs in Matt. xv. 17; but in the latter passage also οὐ is the better supported reading. In Mark xi. 13 *not* is completely sufficient. Against the admission of another sort of half ellipsis, that is, of verba simplicia for composita, see my program de verbor. simpl. pro compositis in N. T. usu et caussis. L. 1833. 4to.)

6. Sometimes a partial ellipsis of both the subject and the predicate occurs in one and the same sentence. Gal. v. 13 μόνον
619 μὴ τὴν ἐλευθερίαν εἰς ἀφορμὴν τῇ σαρκί (κατέχητε, τρέψητε, Oecum.
555 ἀποχρήσησθε). The subject as in the second person is obvious
7th ed. from the preceding ἐκλήθητε; and that part of the predicate which forms the copula (κατέχοντες etc., ἦτε, Hm. Vig. 872) is easily gathered from εἰς ἀφορμήν (cf. Jacobs, Philostr. p. 525). Matt. xxvi. 5 (Mark xiv. 2) μὴ ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ sc. τοῦτο γενέσθω or τοῦτο ποιῶμεν, unless we prefer repeating from vs. 4 the two verbs κρατήσ. κ. ἀποκτείν. These words, and Gal. as above, are no more an aposiopesis (Mey. on Gal. [in the earlier eds.]) than the German: *aber nur nicht am Feste* (not on the feast day). On the partial ellipsis in sentences with μή, see Klotz, Devar. II. 669. In 2 Cor. ix. 6 probably with τοῦτο δέ is to be supplied λέγω (Gal. iii. 17; 1 Thess. iv. 15) or φημί (1 Cor. vii. 29; xv. 50) Bos

p. 632 sq.; Franke, Demosth. 83; cf. Hm. Aeschyl. II. 362, or even λογίζεσθε, (for Meyer's previous connection of this τοῦτο δέ with ὁ σπείρων following produces a limping construction, as he himself has felt; and his present view, that τοῦτο δέ is an Acc. Abs., is far-fetched). So too in the phrase οὐχ ὅτι (... ἀλλά), designed to prevent a misapprehension, *I say, I mean*, was originally understood before ὅτι (Schaef. Bos 775; Hm. Vig. 804), Jno. vii. 22 οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐστίν (ἡ περιτομή), ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πατέρων, vi. 46; 2 Cor. i. 24; iii. 5; Phil. iv. 17; 2 Thess. iii. 9. The phrase, however, became so established by use that its origin was no longer thought of, and so Paul could write in Phil. iv. 11: οὐχ ὅτι καθ' ὑστέρησιν λέγω. By the side of this οὐχ ὅτι might be placed οὐχ οἷον ὅτι: Rom. ix. 6 οὐχ οἷον δὲ ὅτι ἐκπέπτωκεν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, i.e. οὐ τοῖον δὲ λέγω, οἷον ὅτι non tale (dico), quale (hoc est) excidisse etc. And the οἷον ὅτι of the later writers (Schaef. Gregor. Cor. p. 105) might then be compared, and as respects circumstantiality of expression the phrases adduced by Lob. Phryn. p. 427 ὡς οἷον, οἷον ὥσπερ. Moreover, 527
two explanations of that Pauline phrase have been propounded: 6th ed.
a. It has been rendered: *but it is impossible that;* for the τε usually attached to οἷον in this sense is in the first place not essential, and secondly it is wanting in the passage adduced by Wetst. from Gorgias Leont. σοὶ οὐκ ἦν οἷον μόνον μάρτυρας ... εὑρεῖν, cf. also Kayser, Philostr. Soph. p. 348,[1] and in the third place probably also οὐχ οἷόν τε δέ might be read (Aelian. 4, 17), and the construction with the Inf. ἐκπεπτωκέναι τὸν λόγον had been resolved by ὅτι, after the fashion of the later language (cf. in Latin *dico quod*)[2]; de Wette's objection falls to the ground, if we take λόγος θεοῦ as Fr. does. b. Some, with Fr., consider οὐχ οἷον, as it is often used in later writers, a negative adverb: *by no means, no such thing* (properly οὐ τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν ὅτι *the thing* 556
is not such that), Polyb. 3, 82, 5; 18, 18, 11. To be sure, the 7th ed.
finite verb then always follows without ὅτι; but Paul may either 620
have employed ὅτι pleonastically (like ὡς ὅτι), or have used and construed the phrase in the sense of *multum abest ut, far from being the case that.* Meyer's solution is in no respect more plausible.

[1] Examples of the personal οἷός ἐστι, such as *Mey.* adduces from Polybius, have no connection with the idiom here examined. Cf. *Weber*, Demosth. p. 469.

[2] On the relation of the Infinitive construction to a clause with ὅτι, see Krü. 253.

In Rom. ix. 16 ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος etc., where it is enough to supply ἐστί, the subject of the impersonal sentence (therefore it is not of him that willeth, does not depend on the will; see, on εἶναί τινος, above, p. 195) is to be gathered from the context: viz. *the attainment of Divine mercy*, vs. 15. Similar is Rom. iv. 16 διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως (ἐστί), ἵνα κατὰ χάριν (ᾖ), *therefore from faith* proceeds that of which I speak, namely (primarily gathered from vs. 14) ἡ κληρονομία. As to Rom. v. 18 see above, no. 2 p. 587.

In Matt. v. 38 ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος, the subject and part of the predicate are likewise omitted; although an indication of the latter is contained in ἀντί. The words, however, are borrowed from Exod. xxi. 24, where δώσεις precedes. In such well-known expressions as the familiar and almost proverbial passages of the law, even a verb may have been suppressed that could not elsewhere have been omitted without ambiguity; see under 3, b. p. 588.[1]

7 Even whole propositions are sometimes omitted by ellipsis (Hm. opusc. p. 159; Vig. 872):

a. Rom. xi. 21 εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται sc. δέδοικα or ὁρᾶτε, which, however, is suggested in μήπως. In Matt. xxv. 9 the text. rec. [and Cod. Sin.] has μήποτε οὐκ, but there is a preponderance of authority † for the reading μήποτε οὐ μή, according to which μήποτε would be
528 taken by itself (as dehortatory) *by no means!* sc. δῶμεν vs. 8 or
8th ed. γενέσθω τοῦτο, cf. Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9; Exod. x. 11. In Luke xvi. 8 there is not so much an omission of φησί or ἔφη as rather an annexation in oratio recta of the further discourse of him to whom the expression ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν belongs. Similar to this is v. 14. In Greek prose ἔφη, or the like, is suppressed only either where a ὁ δέ, οἱ δέ indicates the speaker (Aelian. 9, 29; anim. 1, 6), or where the mere structure of the sentence indicates that some one (else) speaks, as frequently in dialogues. Van Hengel (annotatt. p. 8 sqq.) is wrong in thinking that this ellipsis
621 (ἔφη ὁ θεός) occurs in Matt. xxiii. 34; see, on the other hand, Fr. Bengel's remark on 1 Cor. ix. 24 is a mistake. In Matt. xvi. 7 διελογίζοντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λέγοντες· ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβομεν it is far more suitable to supply before ὅτι the simple sentence ταῦτα λέγει

[1] Akin to this Acc. in a passage of the law is that employed in all languages in demands, e.g. παῖ λοφνίαν, see *Bos* p. 601.

[† The contrary statement is made on p. 504. Οὐ μή, although supported by B C D and by the majority of the less important authorities, recommended by Grsb., and adopted by Lchm., Tisch. 2d and 7th, Alf., Treg., de Wette, Mey. et al., has been abandoned by Tisch. 8th ed. for οὐκ, which is supported by (besides ℵ) A L Z 33 etc. — J. H. T.]

and render ὅτι by *because*, than to take ὅτι for the particle introducing the oratio recta. In Jno. v. 6, 7, the answer ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω, ἵνα . . . βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν does not seem to correspond directly to the question θέλεις ὑγιὴς γενέσθαι; so that a simple *yes, certainly*, may be supposed to be omitted. But the sick man does not stop at this simple affirmation, but immediately proceeds to state the obstacle which has hitherto opposed his wish. On passages such as Jno. i. 8 οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖνος τὸ φῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαρτυρήσῃ, ix. 3, see p. 316 sq. 557 7th ed.

b. Sometimes a long protasis is followed by no apodosis, e.g. 2 Thess. ii. 3 f. ὅτι ἐὰν μὴ ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀποστασία πρῶτον . . . ὅτι ἔστιν θεός, it is necessary to understand from vs. 1: *the* παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου *does not arrive*. The long protasis[1] involves this omission. So, in particular, the apodosis is wanting to a protasis with ὥσπερ in Matt. xxv. 14; Rom. v. 12; ix. 22 ff. see § 63, I. 1 p. 569 sq.

Likewise, in quotations from the O. T. there sometimes seems to be an ellipsis of an entire sentence, as in 1 Cor. i. 31 ἵνα, καθὼς γέγραπται, ὁ καυχώμενος ἐν κυρίῳ καυχάσθω. After ἵνα a γένηται or πληρωθῇ may be understood. The apostle, however, unconcerned about the grammatical sequence, attached the words of Scripture directly to his own as integral parts of the statement, just as in Rom. xv. 3 he introduces in direct discourse the words of Christ from Ps. lxix., cf. xv. 21. In 1 Cor. ii. 9 f., however, we must not with Mey. [èds. 1st and 2d] take vs. 10 for the apodosis to ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς etc.; but Paul, instead of saying, in continuity with ἀλλά, τοῦτο ἡμῖν etc., annexes the antithesis directly to the words of the quotation, so that ἀλλά remains without grammatical sequence.

II. Aposiopesis, or the suppression of a sentence or part of a sentence in consequence of emotion (of anger, cf. Stallb. Plat. Apol. p. 35,[2] sorrow, fear, etc., cf. Quintil. 9, 2, 54; Tiberius and Alexander de figuris in Walz, rhetor. graec. VIII. 536, 450), in which case the gestures of the speaker supply what is wanting (Hm. p. 153), occurs, not merely in forms of oaths (§ 55, note 622 p. 500) in which it became usual, but also after conditional clauses in the following passages: Luke xix. 42 εἰ ἔγνως καὶ σύ, καίγε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ, τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην σου, *if thou also hadst known what concerns thy peace!* sc. how fortunate that would have been 529 6th ed.

[1] To this some refer also Jas. iii. 3 (according to what is undoubtedly the true reading [supported also by Cod. Sin.] εἰ δέ). But the apodosis is probably contained in the words καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα. See the careful discussion by *Wiesinger* in loc.

[2] Like the well-known *quos ego — !* or the German: *warte, ich will dich — !* Eng. *mind, or I'll — !* The aposiopesis may occur even in the form of a question, e.g. Num. xiv. 27 ἕως τίνος τὴν συναγωγὴν τὴν πονηρὰν ταύτην; cf. Acts xxiii. 9 *Lchm.*

(for thee); xxii. 42 *πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρενεγκεῖν τὸ ποτήριον τοῦτο ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· πλήν* etc. In both passages sorrow has suppressed the apodosis. Acts xxiii. 9 *οὐδὲν κακὸν εὑρίσκομεν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ*
558 *τούτῳ· εἰ δὲ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν αὐτῷ ἢ ἄγγελος . . . we find nothing*
7th ed. *evil in this man; but if a spirit has spoken to him or an angel* — (which the Pharisees utter with gestures expressive of reserve), sc. the matter is significant, or requires caution. Others take the words interrogatively (Lchm.): *if, however, . . . has spoken?* how then? what is to be done in that case? See, in general, Fr. Conject. I. 30 sq. The addition *μὴ θεομαχῶμεν* found in some Codd. is a gloss. Bornem. has quietly retracted his earlier conjecture. Moreover, it may be doubted whether in the preceding passage an aposiopesis really occurs, or merely a break in the discourse at vs. 10. In Jno. vi. 62 the apodosis, suggested readily by vs. 61, is omitted with an air of triumph: how strange will that appear to you! In Mark vii. 11 *ὑμεῖς λέγετε· ἐὰν εἴπῃ ἄνθρωπος τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί· κορβᾶν . . . ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς· καὶ οὐκέτι ἀφίετε* etc. the apodosis is to be supplied from vs. 10: *then he does right in keeping his vow*, and consequently ye release him in this case from the obligation *τιμᾶν τὸν πατέρα* etc., see Krebs in loc.[1] 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. is an anacoluthon, and not an aposiopesis. Lastly, in Phil. i. 22 the assumption of an aposiopesis (Rilliet) is quite inadmissible. An aposiopesis is in Greek authors[2] also most frequent after conditional clauses (Plat. sympos. 220 d.). Indeed when two conditional clauses correspond to each other it is quite common to suppress the apodosis after the first (Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 256; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. p. 197), the speaker hastening on to the second clause as the more important, as in Plat. Protag. 325 d. *ἐὰν μὲν ἑκὼν πείθηται· εἰ δὲ μή* — *εὐθύνουσιν ἀπειλαῖς καὶ πληγαῖς,*
623 rep. 9, 575 d. *οὐκοῦν ἐὰν μὲν ἑκόντες ὑπείκωσιν· ἐὰν δὲ μή* etc. Thuc. 3, 3. So Luke xiii. 9 *κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπόν· εἰ δὲ μήγε,*
530 *εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν if it bear fruit, well* (let it remain);
6th ed. *but if not, then cut it down* (though here *ἄφες αὐτήν* may be

[1] Many expositors find an aposiopesis (?) also in the parallel passage Matt. xv. 5 *ὃς ἂν εἴπῃ τῷ πατρὶ ἢ τῇ μητρί· δῶρον ὃ ἐὰν ἐξ ἐμοῦ ὠφεληθῇς· καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ* — that is, *he acts properly* (in conformity to the law). But perhaps [yet see Meyer's objections] we should, with *Grotius* and *Bengel*, regard the apodosis as commencing with *καὶ οὐ μή*: whoever says to his parents . . . he is not obliged also (in such case) to honor his parents, he is thereby also (in that case) released from the commandment *τίμα τὸν πατέρα*. The *καί* then would not be pleonastic.

[2] From the O. T. cf. Exod. xxxii. 32; Dan. iii. 15; Zech. vi. 15; see *Köster*, Erläuter. der heil. Schrift, S. 97.

supplied from what precedes). (On the omission after εἰ δὲ μή or εἰ δὲ μή γε of the entire conditional clause, to be supplied from the context preceding, see above, p. 583.)

As an aposiopesis ὅρα μή might also be regarded in Rev. xix. 10; xxii. 9, with which may be compared the forms of dehortation or deprecation, frequent in the tragedians, μὴ ταῦτα Eurip. Io 1335, μὴ σύ γε etc. Yet see above, p. 583 sq.

In Rom. vii. 25 to the complaint τίς με ῥύσεται ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ 559
θανάτου τούτου; is annexed, in an overpowering burst of joy, a brief *thanks* 7th ed.
be to God! — also a species of aposiopesis. In unimpassioned style, Paul would have said: thanks be to God that he has already liberated me, etc.

Also in 2 Cor. vii. 12 ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν some have assumed a reservation, where Billroth still wants to supply χαλεπόν τι. Paul would thus have purposely omitted the word, because the affair still gave him pain. But ἔγραψα is of itself complete.

§ 65. REDUNDANT STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; PLEONASM (SUPERFLUITY),[1] DIFFUSENESS.

1. A Pleonasm[2] is the opposite of an ellipsis, as redundance is the opposite of deficiency. A pleonasm, accordingly, would be exemplified in the addition of a word that is not intended to add anything to the meaning of the sentence (Hm. opusc. I. 217, 222). 624
In point of fact the earlier philologists not only believed in the existence of superfluous words, especially particles (Hm. opusc. p. 226), but Kühnöl on Matt. v. 1 (cf. Weiske, pleon. p. 34) goes so far as to maintain that τὸ ὄρος may be used for ὄρος. But as this (pleonasm of the definite article) is a downright absurdity, so is the existence of expletives in the Greek literary language a figment. In general, pleonasm, which takes place chiefly in pred-

[1] See *Fischer*, Weller. III. I. 269 sqq.; *B. Weiske*, Pleonasmi graeci s. commentar. de vocib., quae in sermone Graeco abundare dicuntur. Lips. 1807. 8vo.; *Poppo*, Thucyd. I. I. 197 sqq.; in reference to the N. T. *Glass.* Phil. sacra I. 641 sqq. (it relates, however, more to the O. T., and is on the whole meagre); *Bauer*, Philol. Thucyd. Paull. p. 202 sqq.; *Tzschucke*, de sermon. J. Chr. p. 270 sqq.; *Haab* S. 324 ff.; *J. H. Maii* diss. de pleonasmis ling. graec. in N. T. Giess. 1728. (10 sheets). This writer had intended to write a work on Pleonasms in general; see his observatt. in libr. sacr. I. 52. Another work, by *M. Nascou*, announced in a Prodromus (Havn. 1787. 8vo.), failed, in like manner, to make its appearance.

[2] *Glassius*, as above, has sensible remarks on the definition of a pleonasm; cf. also *Flacii* clavis script. sacr. II. 4, 224, and my 1st Progr. de verbis compos. p. 7 sq. Quintil. instit. 8, 3, 53 gives a simple, but, rightly understood, adequate definition: pleonasmus vitium, cum supervacuis verbis oratio oneratur.

icates (Hm. as above, p. 219), consists in ingrafting into a sentence
531 words the full import of which has been already conveyed in
6th ed. another part of the same sentence (or period), either by the same or by an equivalent expression. Even this, however, is done intelligently only when,

a From carelessness, or from want of confidence in the reader's attention, the same thing is (particularly in extended sentences) repeated: nonne tibi ad me venienti nonne dixi? Here *nonne* is intended in reality to be thought but once. So Col. ii. 13 καὶ
560 ὑμᾶς νεκροὺς ὄντας ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμασι . . . συνεζωοποίησεν ὑμᾶς
7th ed. σὺν αὐτῷ, Matt. viii. 1; Eph. ii. 11 f.; Phil. iv. 15 var. [Matt. iv. 16] (Vechner, Hellenol. p. 177 sq.), Mark vii. 25 γυνή, ἧς εἶχεν τὸ θυγάτριον αὐτῆς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, Rev. vii. 2, see § 22, 4 p. 147 sq. (Demosth. Euerg. 688 b. οὗτοι ᾤοντο ἐμέ, εἰ πολλά μου λάβοιεν ἐνέχυρα, ἄσμενον ἀφήσειν με τοὺς μάρτυρας), 1 Cor. vii. 26 νομίζω τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν . . . ὅτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ, Rev. xii. 9 (?) cf. V. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. 14 sq.; 2 Tim. iv. 9 σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρός με ταχέως, 2 Cor. viii. 24 τὴν ἔνδειξιν τ. ἀγάπης . . . ἐνδεικνύμενοι (yet see § 32, 2 p. 224) cf. Plato, legg. 12, 966 b. τὴν ἔνδειξιν τῷ λόγῳ ἀδυνατεῖν ἐνδείκνυσθαι (Xen. Cyr. 8, 2, 5). To this head may be referred also Rom. ix. 29 Sept. ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὡμοιώθημεν (in the parallel member ὡς . . . ἂν ἐγενήθημεν), as well as λογίζεσθαί or ἡγεῖσθαί τινα ὡς 2 Cor. x. 2; 2 Thess. iii. 15; Lucian. Peregr. 11 (instead of the Acc. alone, cf. חָשַׁב כְּ Job xix. 11), as even in Greek authors we find νομίζειν ὡς (yet see Stallb. Plat. Phileb. p. 180) and the like. Different are Luke xx. 2 εἶπον πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγοντες, Mark xii. 26 πῶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς λέγων, Acts xxviii. 25 τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάλησεν . . . λέγον etc. In all these passages the Participle serves to introduce (as frequently in the Sept.) the direct discourse (cf. the well-known ἔφη λέγων Döderlein, Synon. IV. 13), which might assuredly be annexed immediately to εἶπον, εἶπε. Different from this, again, are Matt. xxii. 1; Luke xii. 16, and still more Luke xiv. 7; xvi. 2; xviii. 2, etc.

Another mode of introducing the direct discourse, Luke xxii. 61
625 ὑπεμνήσθη τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ, Acts xi. 16 ἐμνήσθην τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου, ὡς ἔλεγεν, is to be referred to circumstantiality (see below, no. 4 p. 606 sq.), like the usage of even Attic authors, Xen. Cyr. 8, 2, 14 λόγος αὐτοῦ ἀπομνημονεύται, ὡς λέγοι, see Bornem. schol. p. 141, and is not to be deemed a pleonasm.

2. Or when b. one of the synonymous expressions has, from

usage, partially lost its meaning,[1] as in ἀπ' οὐρανόθεν (Iliad. 8, 365), ἔξοχος ἄλλων (Hm. Homer. hymn. in Cerer. 362), or a repetition, originally emphatic, has in course of time become weakened, as πάλιν αὖθις (Hm. Vig. 886). So in the N. T. ἀπὸ μακρόθεν Matt. xxvi. 58; Mark xv. 40; Rev. xviii. 10 (Wetst. I. 524 sq.), ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν Matt. xxvii. 51; Mark xv. 38, ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο Jno. xi. 7 (εὐθέως παραχρῆμα Acts xiv. 10 Cod. D) cf. ἔπειτα 532
μετὰ ταῦτα Dem. Neaer. 530 etc., εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο or ταῦτα Arist. 6th ed.
rhet. 2, 9, 13; Plat. Lach. 190 e. For similar instances, see Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 343; III. II. 38;[2] in Latin *deinde postea* Cic. Mil. 561
24, 65, *post deinde*, *tum deinde* etc. Vechner, Hellenol. p. 156 sqq. 7th ed.
Also Luke xix. 4 προδραμὼν ἔμπροσθεν (Xen. C. 2, 2, 7; 7, 1, 36), iv. 29 ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω, Luke xxiv. 50 ἐξάγειν ἔξω, Rev. iii. 12 (Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 337; Bornem. schol. 166 sq.), Acts xviii. 21 πάλιν ἀνακάμπτειν (Ceb. 29, cf. Kritz, Sallust. I, 88), Mark vii. 36 μᾶλλον περισσότερον (§ 35, 1 p. 240, cf. Hm. opusc. 222; Vechner, Hellenol. p. 166 sqq.), Luke xxii. 11 ἐρεῖτε τῷ οἰκοδεσπότῃ τῆς οἰκίας[3] (Bornem. in loc.), Rev. xviii. 22, cf. Odyss. 14, 101 συῶν συβόσια, Her. 5, 64 στρατηγὸν τῆς στρατιῆς, Plato, legg. 2, 671 d.; Cedren. I. 343; Theocr. 25, 95; Jno. xii. 13 τὰ βαΐα τῶν φοινίκων (βαΐα of itself signifies palm branches), Acts ii. 30 ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν ὁ θεός, cf. Exod. xxv. 12. See Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 10; Bornem. Xen. conv. 186; Pflugk, Eurip. Hec. p. 18; Lob. paralip. 534 sqq.

To this head are to be referred the established *schemata:*

a. that καί is used after particles of comparison, Acts xi. 17 626
εἰ τὴν ἴσην δωρεὰν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεὸς ὡς καὶ ἡμῖν, 1 Cor. vii. 7 θέλω πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἶναι ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν (see above, p. 440); for the *also* is already implied in the comparison, which makes this very declaration that something takes place *also* in the case of a second object.

[1] From the department of Etymology may be adduced, as instances of the same nature, the double comparatives μειζότερος etc., see § 11, 2 p. 69. In German, cf. *mehrere*, for which pedantic purists would substitute, both in writing and speaking, *mehre*.

[2] Cf. from later writers ἀπὸ πανταχόθεν Const. Manass. p. 127, ἀπὸ πρωΐθεν or μηκόθεν Theophan. cont. 519, 524, ἐκ δυσμόθεν Nicet. Annal. 18, p. 359 d., ἐκ παιδόθεν or νηπιόθεν Malal. 18, p. 429; 5, p. 117, ἕνεκα περί Cedren. I, p. 716, περὶ ... ἕνεκα Niceph. Cpolit. p. 6, 35, ἀνθ' ὧν ἕνεκα Theophan. cont. p. 138, ἀνθ' ὧν ὅτι Deut. xxviii. 62. On the last examples, see *Hm.* opusc. 220.

[3] Οἰκοδομεῖν οἰκίαν Luke vi. 48 is no more a pleonasm than *aedificare domum*, as both verbs acquired at a very early period, from usage, the signification of *to build* (generally). See other instances of the sort in *Lobeck*, paralip. p. 501 sq.

β. that an additional negative is annexed to a verb of negation in a clause dependent on that verb and supplementing it, 1 Jno. ii. 22 ὁ ἀρνούμενος, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός, Luke xx. 27 ἀντιλέγοντες, μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν (Xen. C. 2, 2, 20; An. 2, 5, 29; Isocr. Trapez. 360; Dem. Phorm. 585; Thuc. 1, 77), Heb. xii. 19 οἱ ἀκούσαντες παρῃτήσαντο μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον (Thuc. 5, 63), Gal. v. 7 τίς ὑμᾶς ἐνέκοψε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μὴ πείθεσθαι (Eurip. Hec. 860). Cf. further Luke iv. 42; Acts xx. 27; 1 Pet. iii. 10 (Thuc. 5, 25; 7, 53; Plat. Phaed. 117 c.; Demosth. Phaenipp. 654 b.; see Vig. pp. 459, 811; Alberti, observ. p. 470 sq.; Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 10; Bttm. exc. 2 in Mid. p. 142 sqq.; Mtth. 1242 f.).

The German employs a similar construction in the conversational style; and this usage in Greek may be accounted for by the circumstantiality peculiar to familiar discourse, since in these verbs the force of the negation gradually became less sensible, and thus was expressly renewed in the dependent clause, cf. Mdv. S. 248. Recent writers, indeed, maintain that this mode of expression is
562 not to be considered as pleonastic (Hm. opusc. p. 232; Klotz,
7th ed. Devar. p. 668 [1]); yet logically one of the negatives is undeniably
533 superfluous. (But even in the N. T. the negation is not always
6th ed. subjoined, e.g. after verbs of hindering Luke xxiii. 2; Acts viii. 36 [1 Thess. ii. 16]; Rom. xv. 22; cf. Mtth. 1243; Mdv. 248; Klotz, Devar. p. 668.)

On the other hand, the following constructions are different from the preceding: Acts x. 15 πάλιν ἐκ δευτέρου (cf. Jno. iv. 54), Jno. xxi. 16 πάλιν δεύτερον (Plut. Phil. c. 15), Gal. iv. 9 πάλιν ἄνωθεν (Isocr. Areopag. p. 338 πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς), *rursus denuo* (Hand, Tursell. II. 279); in all which passages a more definite word is added as explanatory. Still greater difference is there in Acts v. 23 according to the reading τοὺς φύλακας ἔξω ἑστῶτας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν (Xen. Cyr. 7, 1, 23); also in Luke ii. 36 αὕτη ἦν προβεβηκυῖα ἐν ἡμέραις πολλαῖς (cf. i. 7, 18), for the meaning is: she was *far* advanced (Lucian. Peregr. 27 ποῤῥωτάτω γήρως προβεβηκώς); Rev. ix. 7 τὰ ὁμοιώματα τῶν ἀκρίδων ὅμοια ἵπποις, for ὁμοιώματα signifies
627 *forms*, cf. Ezek. x. 22; 1 Pet. iii. 17 εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ si placuerit voluntati divinae, since θέλημα means the will itself and θέλειν the operation of the will (like the *stream streams* etc.) cf. Jas. iii. 4. In Jno. xx. 4, however, προέδραμεν τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου is to be taken thus: he ran on before, faster than Peter (closer specification). In 2 Pet. iii. 6 ὕδατι would not be superfluous even if ὑδάτων were supplied with δι' ὧν;

[1] Non otiosam esse negationem in ejusmodi locis, sed ita poni infinitivum, ut non res, quae prohibenda videatur, intelligatur, sed qua vi ac potestate istius prohibitionis jam non fiat.

it would designate water as an element, whereas ὕδατα (cf. Gen. vii. 11) would signify the concrete (separate) bodies of water. Cf. further, Jude 4. As to Heb. vi. 6 see my 3d Progr. de verbb. compos. p. 10. That Luke xx. 43 ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου (Heb. i. 13) *footstool of thy feet*, Gen. xvii. 13 ὁ οἰκογενὴς τῆς οἰκίας σου (Deut. vii. 13) are not, on account of the Gen. annexed, entirely similar to the preceding examples, is obvious. Lastly, such passages as Mark viii. 4 ὧδε ... ἐπ' ἐρημίας, xiii. 29 ἐγγὺς ... ἐπὶ θύραις, 2 Tim. ii. 10 do not properly fall under the notion of pleonasm (Heinichen, Euseb. II. 186), but of apposition. Likewise Mark xii. 23 ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει, ὅταν ἀναστῶσι can hardly be called diffuseness, as the last clause here is an application of the general ἐν τῇ ἀναστ. to the brothers mentioned in vs. 20 ff. See Lob. paralip. p. 534. As a *half* pleonasm might ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας Eph. v. 2 (both derivatives of ὄζω) be regarded, and compared perhaps to παίδων ἄπαις (Eurip. Androm. 613; Hm. opusc. p. 221). But it signifies *an odor of sweet smell*; ὀσμή is the smell as inhaled, εὐωδία is its quality.

3. c. Lastly, many redundancies are attributable to a blending of two constructions, Hm. opusc. p. 224; Vig. p. 887; as, Luke ii. 21 ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτώ ... καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα (instead of ἐπλήσθ. δὲ ἡμ. ... καί, or ὅτε ἐπλ. ... ἐκλήθη), vii. 12 ὡς ἤγγισε 563
τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκώς, Acts x. 17. To 7th ed.
this head might be referred also Rom. ix. 29 (see under a.); and it is even possible that ὅτι before the oratio recta originated in this way (Rost, Gr. 641). With more assurance may we explain thus the pleonastic negation in the phrase ἐκτὸς εἰ μή (Devar. 1, 74): 1 Cor. xiv. 5 μείζων ὁ προφητεύων ἢ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσαις, ἐκτὸς
εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ *except he interpret*, xv. 2; 1 Tim. v 19. The 534
Germans in colloquial speech often employ a similar mode of 6th ed.
expression: *alle waren zugegen, ausgenommen du nicht; ich komme nicht, bevor du nicht gesagt hast* etc. In the preceding quotation, either ἐκτὸς εἰ διερμηνεύῃ or εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ might have been used. On that and other similar phrases (such as πλὴν εἰ μή) much has been collected by Lob. Phryn. p. 459; cf. also Jacobs, Achill. Tat. p. 869; Doederlein, Oed. Col. p. 382 sqq. On the other hand, in the expression εἰ δὲ μή γε, when it seems to mean, *but if not, otherwise* (after a negative clause) Matt. vi. 1; ix. 17; 2 Cor. xi. 16, the negation cannot be considered as pleonastic according to the original import of the phrase; see Fr. 628
Mt. p. 255.

4. The greater part of what has been called pleonasm in the N. T. (and out of it) is *circumstantiality* or more frequently *fulness* of expression (Hm. opusc. p. 222 sqq. and Vig. 887;

Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 204 sqq.) ; the former of which arises from the writer's endeavor to be rightly understood, and the latter is designed to give vividness, force (solemnity), sonorousness to style. It must also be remembered that the N. T. diction is to a great extent conversational, or akin to it ; and that the above-mentioned peculiarities are pre-eminently characteristic of Oriental expression. Such phraseology differs from pleonasm in this, that every word and part of a word in a sentence contains something intended to add to the general meaning, though it may not be absolutely necessary for the logical completeness of the thought, e.g. Mark i. 17 *ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων*, for which Matt. iv. 19 has *ποιήσω ὑμᾶς ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων*. The opposite is not ellipsis, but conciseness.

In the first place, as respects *circumstantiality* the following cases are to be distinguished :

a. A word, only required once to complete the thought, is repeated in every parallel member where it might have been simply understood :[1] Heb. ii. 16 *οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβρ. ἐπιλαμβάνεται*, Jno. xii. 3 *ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαξε ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ*, Rev. xiv. 2 *ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ . . . καὶ ἡ φωνή, ἣν ἤκουσα*, ix. 21 ; xvi. 18 ; 1 Cor. xii. 12 ; xv. 54 ; Phil. ii. 16 ;
564 iv. 17 ; Jno. x. 10 ; Rev. ix. 1 f. ; Mark i. 40 ; Matt. xviii. 32, cf.
7th ed. in Greek authors, Xen. Mem. 2, 10, 3 ; Demosth. Zenoth. 576 c. ; Long. 2, 3 ; Lucian. Cynic. 9 ; Jacob, Lucian. Alex. 117 ; Poppo, Thuc. III. II. 23 ; in Latin the expressions, especially frequent in Jul. Caesar, *in ea loca, quibus in locis ; dies, quo die* etc. Such repetitions ensure perspicuity, particularly when several words intervene. Sometimes repetitions have a rhetorical aspect, see no. 5.

b. The usual or indispensable instrument (e.g. a human limb) is expressly mentioned along with the action in point : Acts
535 xv. 23 *γράψαντες διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν* (they were to deliver it), xi. 30
6th ed. (2 Cor. xi. 33) ; xix. 11 ; iii. 18 *προκατήγγειλε διὰ στόματος πάντων*
629 *τῶν προφητῶν*, xv. 7 ; Luke i. 70 etc. Cf. from the poets, Eurip. Ion 1187 *χερσὶν ἐκχέων σπονδάς* (var.), Hec. 526 f. ; Theocr. 7, 153 *ποσσὶ χορεῦσαι*, see Lob. Aj. p. 222 f. (Wunder, Recens. p. 17 sq.). But in Rom. x. 15 (Sept.) *ὡς ὡραῖοι οἱ πόδες τῶν εὐαγγελιζομένων*

[1] We must judge differently many of the repetitions used by the orators who had in view the delivery before the people of what they had written ; cf. *Foertsch*, de locis Lysiae, p. 29. Of a different nature also is the repetition of the same word in Plat. Charm. 168 a.

εἰρήνην the notion of *arrival*, implied in πόδες, is very far from being superfluous; and in 1 Jno. i. 1 ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν (Luke ii. 30) an emphasis is obviously intended in the last words, like: *to see with one's own eyes* (Hesiod. theog. 701; Thuc. 2, 11; Aristot. mirab. 160; Heliod. 4, 19; see Bremi, Aesch. I. 124; cf. Jani ars poet. p. 220 sq.). And in Mark vi. 2; Acts v. 12 it is to be considered that the miracles in question were wrought by the laying on of hands. But analogous to this (circumstantial) form of expression is Luke i. 76 προπορεύσῃ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου, ix. 52 (לִפְנֵי), a phrase used also as precisely equivalent to *before* (in reference to inanimate objects): Acts xiii. 24 πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ, cf. Sept. Num. xix. 4 ἀπέναντι τοῦ προσώπου τῆς σκηνῆς, Ps. xxxiv. 6 κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀνέμου.

c. An action which according to the nature of the case precedes another, is also expressed separately, and generally by a participle: Matt. xxvi. 51 ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ, ii. 8 ὅπως κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσω αὐτῷ (xiv. 33), Jno. vi. 5 ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ θεασάμενος etc., Matt. xiii. 31 ὅμοια κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔσπειρεν etc. vs. 33; Acts xvi. 3 (Xen. Eph. 3, 4 ὁ δὲ αὐτὸν λαβὼν ἄγει πρὸς τὸν Ἀνθίαν, see Locella p. 141), Jno. vi. 15 γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἁρπάζειν αὐτόν, Matt. xix. 21. Likewise in 1 Cor. ii. 1 κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ἦλθον οὐ etc. the participle was not necessary. What Bornem. Cyrop. 5, 3, 2 has adduced is of a different nature, as in his passages the participle is separated by several words from its verb. On the other hand, in Luke i. 31 συλλήψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν etc. no one will find a mere redundancy of language; the momentous nature of the favor vouchsafed her is expressed by specifying its several particulars. In Luke xxiv. 50 ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς the participle denotes the symbolical gesture of the person blessing. In Eph. ii. 17 ἐλθών marks a particular both important and demanding distinct consideration; so too in Luke xii. 37. Likewise in Jno. xxi. 13 ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς 565
καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς every separate act of the 7th ed.
wonderful occurrence is designedly specified, and, as it were, placed before the eyes. In Jno. xi. 48 ἐλεύσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι 630
refers to the approach of the Roman armies. See, further, Matt. viii. 3, 7; ix. 18; xxvii. 48; Luke vi. 20 (Ael. 12, 22); Jno. xv. 16; Rev. xvi. 1, 2. And in Acts viii. 35 ἀνοίξας ὁ Φίλιππος τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης εὐηγγελίσατο etc. prob-

ably *ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα* etc. serves for the (solemn) introduction of an important discourse; as undoubtedly is the case in Matt. v. 2 (see Fr. in loc.). Cf. in general, Fischer, de vitiis lexic. p. 223 sqq.; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 134.

d. A word which we are accustomed to think is implied in another is also explicitly stated: Acts iii. 3 *ἠρώτα ἐλεημοσύνην* 536 6th ed. *λαβεῖν* (see Wetst. in loc. and Boisson. Eunap. p. 459; cf. Vir. Aen. 5, 262 loricam . . . donat habere viro), Mark i. 17 *ποιήσω ὑμᾶς γενέσθαι ἁλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων*, see above, p. 606; cf. Exod. xxiii. 15; Demosth. ep. 3, p. 114 b. *ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἀναισθήτους ἀνεκτοὺς ποιεῖν δοκεῖ γίνεσθαι.*

e. In the course of a narration the Hebraistic *καὶ ἐγένετο* is prefixed to particular occurrences: Matt. vii. 28 *καὶ ἐγένετο, ὅτε συνετέλεσεν . . . ἐξεπλήσσοντο*, for which a Greek author would say simply, *καὶ ὅτε* or *ὅτε δὲ συνετ.* etc.[1] On the other hand, in Jno. xi. 11 *ταῦτα εἶπεν, καὶ μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει αὐτοῖς*, neither *ταῦτα εἶπεν* nor *μετὰ τοῦτο* is superfluous; the latter indicates a pause.

To c. might be referred also the use of the participle *ἀναστάς*, as in Matt. ix. 9 *ἀναστὰς ἠκολούθησεν αὐτῷ*, Mark ii. 14; vii. 24; Luke i. 39 (similar to the Hebrew וַיָּקָם). But although here *ἀναστάς* was not necessary, yet this participle is by no means redundant in other passages which expositors bring under the same rule. Thus in Matt. xxvi. 62 *ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ* means obviously: *he stood up* from indignation, he rose (from his seat); similar is Acts v. 17; Mark i. 35 *πρωὶ ἔννυχον λίαν ἀναστὰς ἐξῆλθε rising in the morning, while it was still very dark*, etc.; Luke xv. 18 *ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου* (I will arise and go) *I will forthwith*, etc. In general, too many participles in the N. T. have been represented as redundant; and though the decision 631 may occasionally be doubtful, yet very many of them express notions which were they not expressed would be missed. Thus in 1 Cor. vi. 15 *ἆρας οὖν τὰ μέλη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιήσω πόρνης μέλη;* (see Bengel in loc. 5 56 Aristoph. eq. 1130; Soph. O. R. 1270), 1 Pet. iii. 19 *τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασι* 7th ed. *πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν.* In Luke xii. 37 *παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς drawing near, he will serve them*, even tested by our Western notions, is more striking and vivid than if *παρελθών* had been omitted, (*παρελθών* in Ael. 2, 30 likewise, does not seem to me redundant). Cf. in general, Schaef.

[1] This always occurs when an additional specification of time precedes the principal clause, and the principal verb is then appended either by *καί* (see on this *Fr.* Mt. p. 341), as in Matt. ix. 10; Luke v. 1, 12; ix. 51, or more frequently without a copula, as in Matt. xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1; Mark iv. 4; Luke i. 8, 41; ii. 1 etc. This usage is most frequent in Luke's Gospel. To render this *καί* by *also, even*, is far from a happy thought, *Born.* Schol. p. 25. Besides, this *ἐγένετο* is pleonastic, as the specification of time might be directly joined to the principal verb.

Soph. I. 253, 278; II. 314; Demosth. IV. 623; Pflugk, Eurip. Hel. p. 134; Mtth. 1300 f.

Further, with Acts iii. 3 under d. may be compared Acts xi. 22 ἐξαπέστειλεν Βαρνάβαν διελθεῖν ἕως Ἀντιοχείας (where the ancient versions drop the Inf. as superfluous, though it undoubtedly existed in the text), which, however, properly signifies: *they sent him out* with the commission *to go* etc. Similar is Acts xx. 1 ἐξῆλθεν πορευθῆναι εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν *he departed to go to Macedonia*. Cf. also Caes. civ. 3, 33. On the other hand, 537
I cannot with Born. find a mere redundancy in οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ 6th ed.
αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν Luke xx. 35. The τυχεῖν denotes something not strictly implied in καταξιοῦσθαι preceding, and is required to render the expression complete and perspicuous. Cf. Demosth. cor. p. 328 b. κατ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἄξιός εἰμι ἐπαίνου τυχεῖν, and Bos, exercit. p. 48; Bornem. schol. p. 125.

Such idioms as Mark xi. 5 τί ποιεῖτε λύοντες τὸν πῶλον, Acts xxi. 13 τί ποιεῖτε κλαίοντες καὶ συνθρύπτοντές μου τὴν καρδίαν, in comparison with the usual τί λύετε, κλαίετε, appear to be, in like manner, circumstantial. But *what do ye loosing* properly denotes: what is your intention in loosing, *quid hoc sibi vult?* ποιεῖν, therefore, has not here the general meaning of *do*, which is already contained in every special verb; and the phrase τί λύετε (for) *what loose ye?* may with more probability be regarded as abbreviated, than the preceding phrase as redundant.

5. *Fulness* of expression, by which the writer aims sometimes at didactic or rhetorical force (solemnity), sometimes at graphic vividness, occurs generally in one of the following forms:

a. The same word is once and again repeated in parallel members (Xen. An. 3, 4, 45): Eph. ii. 17 εὐηγγελίσατο εἰρήνην ὑμῖν τοῖς μακρὰν καὶ εἰρήνην τοῖς ἐγγύς, Jno. vi. 63 τὰ ῥήματα ... πνεῦμά ἐστιν καὶ ζωή ἐστιν, Col. i. 28 νουθετοῦντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον καὶ διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον, Jno. i. 10; ix. 5; xiv. 26, 27; xv. 19; xix. 10; Matt. xii. 37; Rom. v. 12; xiv. 14; 1 Cor. i. 24, 27; xiii. 11; 2 Cor. xi. 26; Rom. (iii. 31) viii. 15 οὐκ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας ... ἀλλὰ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας (in Heb. xii. 18, 22 the repetition was essential to perspicuity); 632
1 Cor. x. 1 f. οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διῆλθον, καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο καὶ πάντες ... καὶ πάντες etc. (Caes. bell. gall. 1, 31), Phil. iii. 2; iv. 8; 2 Cor. vii. 2; 1 Cor. xiv. 24; Rev. viii. 7, 12; 1 Cor. vi. 11 ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε, i. 20; iv. 8; 1 Tim. v. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 2 ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος, ἰδοὺ νῦν ἡμέρα σωτηρίας (Arrian. Epict. 567
3, 23, 20), xi. 20; Eph. vi. 12, 17; v. 10; 1 Jno. i. 1; Rev. xiv. 8; 7th ed.

xviii. 2 (likewise the polysyndeton in Rev. vii. 12; Rom. ii. 17 f.; 1 Cor. xiii. 2 may be referred to this head). So often in earnest addresses; as, Matt. xxv. 11 *κύριε, κύριε, ἄνοιξον ἡμῖν*, xxiii. 37; Luke viii. 24; x. 41; xxii. 31; Acts ix. 4, and demands Jno. xix. 6; Krüg. Dion. p. 11. In all these cases it was not to be left to the reader to repeat in thought a word employed once, but as often as it is to be understood the writer expresses it, in order to render its importance perceptible (especially *ἐκ παραλλήλου* Rom. xi. 32; 1 Cor. xv. 21).

b. Especially often (particularly by John) is a thought, intended to be brought out with great precision, expressed affirmatively in one member of a sentence and negatively in another (parallelismus antitheticus, see Hm. opusc. p. 223): Jno. i. 20 *ὡμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο*, Eph. v. 15 *μὴ ὡς ἄσοφοι ἀλλ' ὡς σοφοί*, vs. 17; Jno. i. 3; iii. 16; x. 5 (xviii. 20); xx. 27; 1 Jno. i. 6; ii. 4, 27; Luke i. 20; Acts xviii. 9; 1 Tim. ii. 7; Jas. i. 5, 23; 1 Pet. i. 23; v. 2;
538 Heb. vii. 21; x. 37 (Sept.); xii. 8; Rev. ii. 13; iii. 9 (Deut.
6th ed. xxviii. 13; Isa. iii. 9; xxxviii. 1; Ezek. xviii. 21; Hos. v. 3); cf. Eurip. El. 1057 *φημὶ κοὐκ ἀπαρνοῦμαι*, Ael. an. 2, 43 *οὐκ ἀρνοῦνται οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἀλλ' ὁμολογοῦσι*, especially in the orators, Dem. fals. leg. p. 200 c. *φράσω καὶ οὐκ ἀποκρύψομαι*, see Maii observ. sacr. II. 77 sqq.; Kypke I. 350 sq.; Poppo, Thucyd. I. I. 204; Hm. Med. ed. Elmsley p. 361 and Soph. Oed. Col. p. 41; Philoct. p. 44; Jacob, quaest. Lucian. p. 19; Weber, Demosth. p. 314; Boisson. Eunap. p. 164 sqq.; Maetzner, Antiph. p. 157.

c. In the following combinations graphic effect is aimed at: Acts xxvii. 20 *περιῃρεῖτο ἐλπὶς πᾶσα*, Rom. viii. 22 *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει*, Matt. ix. 35; cf. Diod. S. IV. 41 *περινιψάμενος τὸ σῶμα πᾶν*, Strabo 11, 500 *πολλαῖς συμπληρούμενος πηγαῖς*, Lucian. paras. 12; Long. 4, 15; Cic. sen. 18 *con*surrexisse *omnes*, Liv. 33, 29 cum *omnia* terrore et fuga *com*plessent, see my 2d Progr. de verb. compos. p. 21 sq.

d. Likewise the forms of address in Acts i. 11 *ἄνδρες Γαλιλαῖοι*,
633 iii. 12 *ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται*, ii. 14; v. 35; xiii. 16 have the same (courteous) force (men of Israel!) as the well-known *ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι*, which itself occurs in Acts xvii. 22, or *ἄνδρες δικασταί*. See § 59, 1 p. 523.

Every single word was indispensable in 2 Cor. ii. 16 *οἷς μὲν ὀσμὴ θανάτου εἰς θάνατον, οἷς δὲ ὀσμὴ ζωῆς εἰς ζωήν*. *A savor of death unto death, a savor of life unto life*, means: an odor of death which, from its nature, can bring nothing else than death, etc.

Redundancy of expression is often erroneously supposed to exist in passages where *synonymes* are found connected in order to express (as frequently in Demosth.) a *single* main idea, see Schaef. Demosth. I. 209, 320, 756; Plutarch. IV. 387; V. 106; Weber, Demosth. p. 376; Franke, Demosth. p. 12; Bremi, Aeschin. I. 79; Lucian. Alex. ed. Jacob p. 24; Poppo, Thuc. III. I. 619; Schoem. Plut. Agis 171; cf. Lob. paralip. 61 sq. But Paul, from whom the examples in question have mostly been taken, 568
is not in the habit of combining in one sentence really synonymous expres- 7th ed.
sions, — (not even in Eph. i. 5, 19; ii. 1; iv. 23; 1 Cor. i. 10; ii. 4; 1 Tim. ii. 1; v. 5; cf. Jas. iii. 13; Jno. xii. 49; 1 Pet. i. 4; iv. 9; 1 Jno. i. 1, etc.; Fr. Rom. II. 372). A more careful study of Greek, but especially of apostolic diction, precludes a supposition according to which e.g. the apostolic salutation *χάρις, ἔλεος καὶ εἰρήνη*, would become extremely flat.[1] Likewise there is nothing pleonastic in the combinations *θυμὸς ὀργῆς* Rev. xvi. 19, *πέλαγος τῆς θαλάσσης* Matt. xviii. 6, *ἐπιφάνεια τῆς παρουσίας* 2 Thess. ii. 8, *σπλάγχνα ἐλέους* or *οἰκτιρμοῦ* Luke i. 78; Col. iii. 12. The second of these was correctly rendered *aequor maris* by so early a critic as Wetstein; *πέλαγος*, that is, denotes the expanse (of the sea), and is thus applied to the surface of a river also, see Schwarz, commentar. p. 1067.[2] And *σπλάγχνα* is a comprehensive expression which is more closely defined by the Genitive. The parallelismus membrorum, which occasionally 539
occurs in the N. T. (see § 68, 3), has nothing to do with pleonasm. As 6th ed.
to the parallel distribution of doctrinal particulars in Rom. iv. 25; x. 10, see de Wette on the first passage.

6. The pleonasm of entire sentences is inconceivable. When a sentence is expressed a second time with but slight alteration, the writer's object always is to give to a thought peculiar force, or to exhibit it under different points of view. This occurs in 2 Cor. xii. 7 *τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι, ἐδόθη* 634
μοι σκόλοψ . . . ἵνα με κολαφίζῃ, ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι (where the last words are omitted, it is true, in good Codd. [also Sin.*], but surely only because they seemed superfluous), Rev. ii. 5 *μετανόησον καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἔργα ποίησον· εἰ δὲ μή* (*μετανοεῖς*), *ἔρχομαί σοι ταχὺ καὶ κινήσω τὴν λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῆς, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃς* (cf. Plat. Gorg. 514 a. *ἡμῖν ἐπιχειρητέον ἐστί . . . θεραπεύειν, ὡς βελτίστους αὐτοὺς τοὺς πολίτας ποιοῦντας·*

[1] *Schäfer's* remark, Demosth. I. 320, "usus (synonymorum) duplex, gravior alter, ut vim concilient orationi, alter levior, ut vel aures expleant vel numeros reddant jucundiores," has reference primarily only to the orators.

[2] The investigation of N. T. synonymes (begun not infelicitously by *Bengel*) has lately been prosecuted, rather on the principle of free combination than historically, by *Tittmann* (de synonymis N. T. lib. I. Lipsiae 1829. 8vo.). Further, cf. also the collections and remarks in *Bornemann's* diss. de glossem. N. T. p. 29 sqq.

ἄνευ γὰρ δὴ τούτου, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν εὑρίσκομεν, οὐδὲν ὄφελος ... ἐὰν μὴ καλὴ κἀγαθὴ ἡ διάνοια ᾖ τῶν μελλόντων etc. Stallb. Plat. apol. p. 23). On 1 Cor. xiv. 6 see Mey. On 1 Cor. vii. 26, see above, no. 1 p. 602. On the other hand, in 1 Jno. ii. 27 ὡς τὸ αὐτὸ χρίσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς ... καί, καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς, μενεῖτε ἐν αὐτῷ the resumptive phrase καθώς etc. is so far from being a pleonasm, that it could hardly have been dispensed with. Similar is Rev. x. 3, 4. Cf. as to such expressions Hm.
569 Eurip. Bacch. 1060 and Soph. Antig. 691; Philoct. 269, 454;
7th ed Reisig, conject. Aristoph. p. 314 sq.; Heind. Plat. Phaed. p. 52 and Cic. nat. d. 1, 16; Schaef. Demosth. V. 726; Mtth. 1541 f. Of a different nature is Rev. ii. 13 οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς· ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ σατανᾶ, where ὅπου ὁ θρόνος etc. is immediately annexed to explain (as if in answer to) ποῦ κατοικεῖς. So might also Mark ii. 24 be taken; but τί here is probably *why?* On the other hand, 2 Cor. vii. 8; Jno. xiii. 17 do not come under this head; and in 1 Cor. i. 22 the clause ἐπειδὴ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ... μωρίαν is manifestly not a mere repetition of ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ... τὸν θεόν vs. 21, any more than ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν etc. vs. 23 is a mere echo of the words in vs. 21 εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεός etc. And in Rom. vi. 16 οὐκ οἴδατε, ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε would not have been a mere uttering of *idem per idem*, even had ἤτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην not been straightway annexed to δοῦλοι as a closer specification. As little do the two members of the sentence Rom. vi. 6 ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ completely coincide in sense; the latter is the aim, concretely expressed, of what, designated generally, is the καταργηθῆναι of the σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας. 1 Pet. ii. 16, however, does not remotely come under this head; 2 Pet. iii. 4 also is of a different nature. On Matt.
540 v. 18 there may be a difference of opinion, inasmuch as πάντα in
6th ed. the last clause may be either referred to the law (Olsh., Mey.), or explained with Fr. universally: donec omnia (quae mente fingere queas) evenerint. The latter, however, is not very plausible.

7. We subjoin now several other passages in which, although from of old N. T. expositors have been accustomed to assume the
635 existence of pleonasms, neither pleonasm nor redundancy of any sort occurs. And first of all, there is a statement to which currency has been given even by recent commentators, and which is propped up with misunderstood parallels from Greek authors, that in the N. T. many verbs, viz. ἄρχεσθαι, δοκεῖν, θέλειν, τολμᾶν,

δύνασθαι, when joined with an Infin., are often used pleonastically; Kühnöl on Luke i. 1 represents even ἐπιχειρεῖν to be one of them; cf. Weiske, pleon. under the words. The whole rule is founded in error. In the first place

a. With regard to Luke i. 1 ἐπιχειρεῖν in the clause ἐπειδήπερ πολλοὶ ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνατάξασθαι διήγησιν etc., is no more used without special meaning than is the Latin *aggredi* in aggressus sum scribere (though even philologers share that view, see Herbst, Xen. mem. p. 38, and on the other side, Heind. Plat. soph. p. 450). Luther well renders it: *sintemal es sich viele unterwunden haben* (*whereas many have taken it upon them*) etc. So in all the passages from the classics adduced by Kühnöl.

b. So also τολμᾶν (Weiske p. 121 sq.), *to undertake something*, always implies some matter of difficulty or importance, *sustinere*, *to bring one's self to* (Blume, Lycurg. p. 89), Rom. v. 7; 1 Cor. vi. 1. In Jno. xxi. 12, however, it simply means *audere*, *make bold to;* and it is only respecting the ground of their not venturing to interrogate Jesus that doubt may be entertained. The assertion 570
of Markland, Lys. p. 159 ed. Taylor, ought not to have misled 7th ed.
any expositor.

c. As to δοκεῖν cf. Fr. Matt. iii. 9 and the earlier critic J. D. Michaelis in the Nov. Miscell. Lips. IV. 45. In 1 Cor. x. 12 ὁ δοκῶν ἑστάναι is obviously, *he that thinketh he standeth*, cf. Gal. vi. 3. In Mark x. 42 οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν means, *they who pass for the rulers of the nations*, *are recognized as such* (similar are Gal. ii. 9; Susann. 5; Joseph. antt. 19, 6, 3. The parallel passage Matt. xx. 25 has merely οἱ ἄρχοντες). Luke xxii. 24 τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων *quis videatur habere* (habiturus esse) *principatum*, who was to be judged to have the pre-eminence (over the rest); the matter is still future and so merely an object of conjectural judgment. 1 Cor. xi. 16 εἴ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι *if any one thinks* (it allowable) *to be contentious*, or (Mey. and de Wette) *if any one seems to be contentious*, is an urbane expression. Luke viii. 18 ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν *what he thinks he has.* On 1 Cor. iii. 18; vii. 40; viii. 2; xiv. 37; Heb. iv. 1 (where Böhme regards δοκεῖ as used elegantius, while Kühnöl and Bleek judge more correctly) no remark is required. Cf. in general, Bornem. 635
schol. p. 52 sq.

d. Most of the passages in the Gospels where critics have considered ἄρχεσθαι as pleonastic (cf. too Valcken. Selecta I. 87), have been correctly explained by Fr. Mtth. p. 539 sq. cf. p. 766.

541 In regard to Luke iii. 8 Bengel hints at the truth: omnem excusa-
6th ed. tionis etiam conatum praecidit. In particular, it is quite absurd to regard this verb as redundant in Luke xii. 45; xxi. 28; 2 Cor. iii. 1. In Jno. xiii. 5 ἤρξατο indicates the *commencement* of the action whose completion is related in vs. 12. Acts xxvii. 35 is explained by vs. 36: Paul's ἄρχεσθαι ἐσθίειν was an invitation to the rest to do the same. In Acts xi. 15 Kühnöl adduces as a reason why ἄρξασθαι λαλεῖν must be equivalent to λαλεῖν: ex x. 43 patet, Petrum jam multa de rel. chr. disseruisse etc. But ἄρχεσθαι λαλ. primarily designates only the commencement of the discourse, which for that very reason has not yet been *completed* (Peter intended to continue to speak, x. 44 ἔτι λαλοῦντος τοῦ Π.). But why this commencement is to be referred solely to the first six or eight words is not apparent. Moreover, it must not be overlooked that ἐν τῷ ἄρξασθαί με λαλεῖν in an address, Acts xi., is stronger, as if: scarcely had I uttered a few words, when etc. In Acts xviii. 26 ἤρξατο is to be connected with ἀκούσαντες δὲ αὐτοῦ etc. following. On Acts ii. 4 see Meyer. Likewise in Acts xxiv. 2 the discourse of Tertullus, which to judge from the introduction vs. 3 was undoubtedly intended to be of greater length, probably was interrupted by the corroboration of the Jews vs. 9, and Paul himself broke in immediately after; or vs. 2 is to be taken thus: as soon as he was called, Tertullus *began* etc. (began his discourse forthwith).

e. In regard to θέλειν (Gataker, Mr. Ant. 10, 8) in Jno. v. 35, see Lücke's careful examination of the subject. More plausible
571 is 2 Tim. iii. 12 πάντες οἱ θέλοντες εὐσεβῶς ζῆν ἐν Χριστῷ.
7th ed. But the meaning of these words is: *all who determine*, who are minded, *to live piously* etc. In Heb. xiii. 18 the import of θέλοντες is obvious. Jno. vii. 17 was correctly understood by Kühnöl. And in Jno. vi. 21 that expositor has rejected Bolten's arbitrary explanation; a difference between it and Mark vi. 51 will have to be acknowledged. In 1 Cor. x. 27 καὶ θέλετε πορεύεσθαι is: and *you are willing*, *decide*, to go (instead of declining the invitation). On 1 Pet. iii. 10 see Huther.

f. In opposition to Kühnöl, who considers δύνασθαι in Matt. ix. 15 as pleonastic, see Fr. By BCrus. it is erroneously made
637 to signify *be allowed* or *desire*. Still less should the authoritative word *redundat* mislead us in Luke xvi. 2 and Jno. vii. 7. In the latter passage, in particular, there is obviously an intended difference between δύναται μισεῖν and μισεῖ.

Among nouns erroneously supposed to be sometimes used pleonastically, must be specially mentioned ἔργον when followed by a Genitive (Boisson. Nicet. p. 59) e.g. Rom. ii. 15 ἔργον νόμου, Eph. iv. 12; 1 Thess. i. 3 (see Koppe); see in opposition Fr. on Rom. as above. In 1 Thess., as above, the very parallelism of ἔργον τῆς πίστεως with κόπος τῆς ἀγάπης forbids our taking ἔργον as a pleonasm; see de Wette in loc. The correct view of Eph., as above, has already been given by Flatt. From the Greek authors, also, no instance of ἔργον as a pleonasm can be adduced. In Polyaen. 1, 17 ἔργον τοῦ λογίου undoubtedly means the matter of the oracle, the *deed* foretold in the oracle. In Diog. L. prooem. 1 τὸ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἔργον is *the occupation of philosophizing*, the cultivation of philosophy, cf. 542
just afterwards ἄρξαι φιλοσοφίας (in Latin cf. virtutis *opus* Curt. 8, 14, 37, 6th ed.
proditionis *opus* Petr. fragm. 28, 5), not precisely the fabric, system, of philosophy. Χρῆμα is different from ἔργον, and even χρῆμα with a Genitive is not properly a pleonasm, see Passow under the word. As to ὄνομα (very frequently regarded as pleonastic, see Kühnöl on Jno. p. 133) Wahl has already given the true view (cf. v. Hengel, Philipp. p. 160), see also my Simon. lexic. Hebr. under שֵׁם; yet this word certainly requires a more precise handling than it has yet received in N. T. Lexicons. (As to a periphrastic use of ὄνομα in Greek poets, see Mtth. 965.) In Col. ii. 16 ἐν μέρει ἑορτῆς ἢ νουμηνίας ἢ σαββάτων is no more pleonastic than *in respect* (or *in the matter*) *of* holidays, new moons, etc. Lastly, in Rom. vi. 6 σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας is a single composite idea, *the body of sin*, i.e. the (human) body; respecting the relation of which to sin no reader of Paul's epistles can be at any loss. See above, p. 188.

8. Nearly all the earlier expositors asserted, that by a sort of half pleonasm καλεῖσθαι is used for εἶναι (Graev. lection. Hesiod. p. 22; Porson, Eurip. Hippol. v. 2; Blomfield, Aesch. Pers. p. 128; on the other hand, Ellendt, lexic. Soph. I. 912), in which use at the same time there was thought to be a Hebraism (נִקְרָא, *esse*). But Bretschn. lex. man. p. 209 sets the matter right by saying: *sum* videlicet *ex aliorum sententia*. Cf. van Hengel, Cor. p. 53 sq. 572
As to נִקְרָא see my Simon. lex. p. 867. In the N. T. καλεῖσθαι 7th ed.
always signifies *to be named*, *to be called*, Jas. ii. 23; Matt. v. 19; xxi. 13, especially in reference to names of honor, which denote the possession of a certain dignity, Matt. v. 9; Luke i. 76; 1 Jno. iii. 1; Rom. ix. 26. It is used even as antithetical to εἶναι (*to be*), 638
1 Cor. xv. 9 (even so much as to bear the name of an apostle), Luke xv. 19. Nor can ὀνομάζεσθαι Rom. xv. 20 (1 Cor. v. 1); Eph. i. 21; iii. 15; v. 3 be weakened down to a mere *esse;* (it is even emphatic, as μηδέ in the last passage shows).[1] It is an

[1] The passages adduced by *Schwarz*, Comment. p. 719 sq., from Greek authors to

utter perversion when many expositors render even Heb. xi. 18 *ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεταί σοι σπέρμα* : *existet tibi posteritas ;* (Schulz, too, very inaccurately translates it : *thou wilt receive offspring*).

Εὑρίσκεσθαι also is said (see Pott on 1 Cor. iv. 2 ; cf. the annotators on Plut. educ. 13, 5), like נִמְצָא (cf. on the other hand my Simonis p. 575), often to be used instead of *εἶναι*. But these two verbs are always distinguished from each other by this, that *εἶναι* denotes the quality of a thing in itself, while *εὑρίσκεσθαι* denotes that quality as found, discovered, recognized, in the subject. Matt. i. 18 *εὑρέθη ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα it proved* (*it appeared*) *that she was with child* (*ἦν ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχουσα* might have been previously
543 said), Luke xvii. 18 *οὐχ εὑρέθησαν ὑποστρέψαντες δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ*
6th ed. *θεῷ εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος ; were none found* (as it were, did none show themselves) *who returned ?* Acts viii. 40 *Φίλιππος εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον Philip was found* (cf. *πνεῦμα κυρίου ἥρπασε τὸν Φίλ.* vs. 39) *at Ashdod* (properly, transported to Ashdod, by the *πνεῦμα κύρ.* that carried him away), Rom. vii. 10 *εὑρέθη μοι ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωὴν αὕτη εἰς θάνατον it proved, appeared* (from Paul's personal experience vss. 8–10) *that the commandment for life had become to me a commandment for death*, Gal. ii. 17 *εἰ δὲ . . . εὑρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί but if we ourselves were found sinners* (before God and man), 1 Cor. iv. 2 ; 2 Cor. v. 3 ; Phil. iii. 9 ; Rev. xii. 8 *οὐδὲ τόπος εὑρέθη αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ neither was their place any more found* (any more to be seen) in heaven, as we say : every trace of them was blotted out (cf. Rev. xvi. 20 ; xviii. 21 ; xx. 11), 1 Pet. ii. 22 *οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ nor was guile found in his mouth*, no guile could be detected in his words (Rev. xiv. 5). Phil. ii. 7 was correctly rendered by Luther. The Greek passages adduced as parallel, by Kypke I. 2 ; Palairet p. 198 ; Schwarz et al., prove nothing. In Mr. Anton. 9, 9 *τὸ συναγωγὸν ἐν τῷ κρείττονι ἐπιτεινόμενον εὑρίσκετο* etc.
573 *εὑρίσκομαι* retains its proper meaning : *was found*. Hierocl. in
7th ed. carm. Pythag. p. 88 ed. Lond. *ἀρχὴ μὲν τῶν ἀρετῶν ἡ φρόνησις εὑρίσκεται* is : *prudentia virtutum principium esse deprehenditur*,
639 i.e. *it is found by the considerate that* etc. ; Eurip. Iph. Taur. 777 (766) *ποῦ ποτ' ὄνθ' εὑρήμεθα ;* ubi tandem esse deprehendimur (deprehensi sumus) ? *whither* does it turn out that we have wandered ? In Joseph. antt. 17 (not 7), 5, 8 *εὑρίσκ.* refers to those very persons in whose opinion Herod wished to avoid standing

prove that *καλεῖσθαι* or *ὀνομάζεσθαι* is used for *εἶναι*, dispose of themselves for an attentive reader. The attempt to take *nominari* for *esse* in Cic. Flacc. 27 is truly ridiculous.

unfavorably. Cf. also Soph. Trach. 410; Aj. 1114 (1111); Diod. Sic. 3, 39; 19, 94; Athen. I. 331; Schweigh. Philostr. Apoll. 7, 11; Alciphr. 1, 30. In Ignat. ad Rom. 3 λέγεσθαι χριστιανόν and εὑρίσκεσθαι χριστιανόν are contrasted.[1]

9. Among the particles, ὡς in particular has frequently been regarded as pleonastic, as in 2 Pet. i. 3 ὡς πάντα ἡμῖν τῆς θείας δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ . . . δεδωρημένης. But ὡς combined with the participle in the construction of the Gen. absol. imparts to the verbal notion the impress of subjectiveness, of a persuasion or purpose. Hence the preceding passage, taken in connection with vs. 5, must be rendered: *persuaded* (reflecting) *that the divine power has bestowed on us all things*, . . . *earnestly endeavor* etc., ἡγούμενοι, ὅτι ἡ θεία δύναμις . . . δεδώρηται (1 Cor. iv. 18), cf. Xen. C. 3, 3, 4 ὡς εἰρήνης οὔσης *on the understanding of there being peace*, 3, 1, 9 ὡς τἀληθῆ ἐροῦντος *assured that I am telling the truth*, cf. 6, 1, 37; Mem. 1, 6, 5; Strabo 9, 401; Xen. Eph. 4, 2; Dion. Hal. III. 1925; 544
see Ast, Plat. Polit. p. 320; Loesner, obs. p. 483; Lob. Soph. Aj. 6th ed.
p. 203; Fr. Rom. II. 360. (In Greek authors this particle is thus connected also with the Acc. absol., e.g. Xen. C. 1, 4, 21; An. 7, 1, 40.) Ὡς is likewise, with the same import, put before a Dative governed by a verb, Acts iii. 12 ἢ ἡμῖν τί ἀτενίζετε ὡς ἰδίᾳ δυνάμει . . . πεποιηκόσιν etc. In Rom. xv. 15 ὡς ἐπαναμιμνήσκων, the particle ὡς means *as* (of the characteristic): as one who reminds you according to the grace of God.

In Rom. ix. 32 ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, the expression ἐκ πίστεως denotes the objective standard; ὡς ἐξ ἔργων, the purely imaginary. 2 Cor. xiii. 7; Jno. vii. 10; Philem. 14 also are to be traced back to a comparison. And Matt. vii. 29 ἦν διδάσκων ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, Jno. i. 14 δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός, mean simply: *as* one having authority, *as* of the only begotten etc., and even in these instances the particle does not of itself indicate what exists *revera*, though, if we regard *the sense*, 640
this idea is implied in the comparison (*exactly as*, *altogether as*, *like*, i.e. *the true*, *perfect* glory of the Son of God, etc.).

In reference to ὡς ἐπί Acts xvii. 14 we have to remark, that ὡς joined to a preposition of direction (ἐπί, πρός, εἰς) expresses either the actual 574
purpose of taking a certain direction, or even the mere pretence or 7th ed.
assumed appearance of doing so, Kühner II. 280. In the preceding passage, Beza, Grotius, and others have understood it in the latter sense;

[1] The same applies to the Latin *invenire* (e.g. Cic. Lael. 12, 42), which *Schwarz* in the like clumsy way represents as equivalent to *esse*. Even in Malalas εὑρίσκεσθαι, in most passages, still retains clearly the signification of *inveniri*, e.g. 14 p. 372. So also in Theophan.; see the Index in the Bonn edition.

the former interpretation, however, is simpler and more suited to the context. As parallel instances, cf. Thuc. 5, 3; 6, 61; Xen. An. 1, 9, 23; 7, 7, 55; Diod. S. 14, 102; Polyb. 5, 70, 3; Arrian. Al. 2, 17, 2; 3, 18, 14. See besides, Ellendt, Lexic. Soph. II. 1004. Also in ὡς ὅτι, in immediate succession[1] (as it were, *as that*), ὡς properly indicates that the statement introduced by ὅτι is a mere report, an alien or even pretended opinion, Isocr. Busir. argum. p. 520 κατηγόρουν αὐτοῦ ὡς ὅτι καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρει. So also 2 Thess. ii. 2 εἰς τὸ μὴ σαλευθῆναι ὑμᾶς ... μήτε διὰ λόγου μήτε δι' ἐπιστολῆς ... ὡς ὅτι ἐνέστηκεν ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. In 2 Cor. xi. 21, likewise, this import of ὡς is perceptible (see Mey. in loc.), and in 2 Cor. v. 19, if the statement be regarded as the substance of the διακονία τῆς καταλλαγῆς conferred. In the earlier authors, too, ὡς ὅτι is thus used Xen. H. 3, 2, 14; Dion. H. III. 1776.[2] Among the later (Theodoret. epp. p. 1294) see Thilo, Act. Thom. p. 10 sq. and Lehrs de Aristarch. p. 34. Similar, but decidedly pleonastic, is ὡς ἵνα in Byzantine writers, as in Duc. 8. p. 31, 127; Jo. Canan. p. 467, 470 f. Still more strange is ἵν' ὅπως Constant. Man. p. 62; Geo. Acropol. p. 62. (As to the earlier ὡς οἷον, see Bast, ep. crit. p. 43; Hm. opusc. I. 219 sq.)

545 Οὕτως also has been said to be redundant in Jno. iv. 6 (Kühnöl): ὁ
6th ed. Ἰησοῦς κεκοπιακὼς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως. But this adverb is frequently employed thus after a participle to repeat the participial notion: *wearied with the journey, sat down thus* (sic ut erat, in consequence of this fatigue), Xen. A. 4, 5, 29; C. 5, 2, 6; 7, 5, 71; Hellen. 7, 4, 20; Arrian. Al. 5, 27, 13; Ellendt, Arrian. I. 4. On οὕτω at the beginning of an apodosis, see § 60, 5 p. 541.

10. A half pleonasm of a particle is found by Palairet p. 305, after Glassius, in Acts xiii. 34 μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, where μηκέτι is supposed to stand for the simple μή (as Christ had never gone to corruption). But the phrase εἰς διαφθορὰν ὑποστρέφ. denotes, as so early a critic as Bengel per-
641 ceived, simply to (die and) be buried. The quotation from Aelian. 12, 52 is of no force; μηκέτι there signifies: *no longer* (as hitherto), just like οὐκέτι in Jno. xxi. 6. Many used to teach a half pleonastic use of οὐκέτι also; but likewise erroneously. In Rom. vii. 17 νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό, ἀλλ' ἡ ... ἁμαρτία is:
575 *now, however*, after having made this observation vs. 14 sqq., *it is*
7th ed *no longer I that do the evil*, i.e. I can no longer consider *myself* the primary cause of it, cf. vs. 20. Rom. xi. 6 εἰ δὲ χάριτι, οὐκέτι

[1] In Aristot. Pol. 3, 7 ὡς ὅτι is used differently; that is, ὡς corresponds to an antecedent οὕτως.

[2] For separated, so that ὅτι in the course of the sentence resumes ὡς, both particles were used at an early period, *Schoem.* Isae. p. 294; *Jacobs*, Achill. Tat. p. 566.

ἐξ ἔργων is: *if by grace, then* (it is) *no more* (further) *of works*, i.e. the latter thought is annihilated by the former, it can no longer exist. Rom. xiv. 13, 15; 2 Cor. i. 23; Gal. ii. 20; iii. 18 are plain. In Jno. iv. 42 οὐκέτι derives elucidation from vs. 41, where διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ is antithetical to διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικός vs. 39; two motives for πιστεύειν are distinguished, an earlier and a later. As to Jno. xv. 15 see Lücke. Moreover, Xen. A. 1, 10, 12 cannot be adduced in support of such a use of οὐκέτι, and still less (μηκέτι) Xen. Eph. 1, 13 (in Paus. 8, 28, 2 recent editors give οὐκ ἔστι, yet see Siebelis in loc.). Cf. also Lucian. Parasit. 12; Sext. Emp. Math. 2, 47; Arrian. Epict. 3, 22, 86. Likewise on Aelian. Anim. 4, 3 Jacobs admits that οὐκέτι is used for the simple negation paullo majore cum vi.

§ 66. CONDENSED AND EXPANDED STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES (BREVILOQUENCE, CONSTRUCTIO PRAEGNANS, ATTRACTION, ETC.).

1. The inherent predilection of the Greeks for terseness and compactness of discourse exhibits itself even in prose in various modes of expression, some of which are to be found in the N. T. They all, however, agree in this, that an intermediate member not absolutely essential to the sense is omitted, and the other parts of the sentence are drawn together into one compound whole. Cf. Mtth. 1533 ff.; Doederlein, de brachylogia serm. gr. et lat. Erlang. 1831. 4to. This breviloquence is akin to ellipsis, yet different from it, inasmuch as in an elliptical sentence the grammatical structure always indicates the omission of a definite individual word, while in breviloquence the break is always covered up by the structure. 546 6th ed.

To breviloquence belong the following cases: 642

a. To a protasis is joined an apodosis without a direct connection: Rom. xi. 18 εἰ δὲ κατακαυχᾶσαι, οὐ σὺ τὴν ῥίζαν βαστάζεις, ἀλλὰ ἡ ῥίζα σέ *but if thou* . . . then know or reflect that, *not thou*, etc. 1 Cor. xi. 16. The full structure would be: ἴσθι (διανοοῦ), ὅτι οὐ σύ etc.; cf. Clem. ad Cor. I. 55. The sentence could not be called elliptical unless it ran thus: εἰ δὲ κατακ., ὅτι οὐ σύ etc.; then ὅτι would point to an actually omitted word, such as, *know* or *consider*. In like manner, in Latin, *scito* is often suppressed between the protasis and the apodosis, Cic. or. 2, 12, 51. Cf. also 1 Jno. v. 9 εἰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων λαμβάνομεν, ἡ μαρτυρία

576 τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων ἐστίν, we must consider that the testimony of God
7th ed. etc., or, we must much more receive the testimony of God, which etc.; 1 Cor. ix. 17. (In Rom. ii. 14, however (Fr.), the protasis and the apodosis are connected without any difficulty.) In Matt. ix. 6 ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε, ὅτι ἐξουσίαν ἔχει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου . . . (τότε λέγει τῷ παραλυτικῷ) ἐγερθεὶς ἆρόν σου τὴν κλίνην, where the words inserted by the Evangelist do not belong to the structure of the sentence: *that ye may know . . . stand thou up and take* etc., i.e. the paralytic shall at my command immediately rise up, I command the paralytic: Stand up etc. (analogous to this are the constructions so frequent in the orators, such as Dem. cor. 329 c. ἵνα τοίνυν εἰδῆτε, ὅτι αὐτός μοι μαρτυρεῖ . . . λαβὼν ἀνάγνωθι τὸ ψήφισμα ὅλον, see Kypke and Fr. in loc.). Jno. ix. 36 καὶ τίς ἐστι, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν; sc. *I wish to know, in order that* etc., cf. i. 22.

A breviloquence similar to that in sentences with ἵνα takes place when through ἀλλ' ἵνα an event is referred to a prophetic prediction, as in Jno. xv. 25; xiii. 18; Mark xiv. 49; cf. 1 Cor. ii. 9. Yet in such passages what is wanting before ἵνα may usually be supplied from the preceding context, see Fr. exc. 1. ad Matt. p. 841.

b. To a general predicate, the appropriate verb of which is omitted, a special verb (with its predicate) is directly annexed: Phil. iii. 13 f. ἐγὼ ἐμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατειληφέναι, ἓν δέ, τὰ μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς δὲ . . . κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω etc. for ἓν δὲ ποιῶ, κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω, cf. Liv. 35, 11 in eos se impetum facturum et nihil prius (facturum), quam flammam tectis injecturum. 2 Cor. vi. 13 τὴν δὲ αὐτὴν ἀντιμισθίαν . . . πλατύνθητε καὶ ὑμεῖς for τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ ὅ ἐστιν ἀντιμισθία etc. see Fr. diss. in 2 Cor. II. 115; as to the Acc., however, cf. Hm. opusc. I. 168 sq. Similar is Jude 5 ὅτι ὁ κύριος λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας τὸ δεύτερον
643 τοὺς μὴ πιστεύσαντας ἀπώλεσεν. Here the verb to be connected
547 with τὸ δεύτ. would properly have been οὐκ ἔσωσε (ἀλλά etc.):
6th ed. the Lord, after having delivered them, did, *on a second occasion* (when they were in need of his helping grace), refuse them his delivering grace and destroy them etc. Cf. further Rom. xi. 23 δυνατός ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς πάλιν ἐγκεντρίσαι αὐτούς. The αὐτοί are those that grew upon the stock κατὰ φύσιν; they therefore cannot be ingrafted on the stock *again*. In strictness the language ought to run: *again* to unite them to the stock, viz. by ingrafting.

On the other hand, Col. iii. 25 ὁ ἀδικῶν κομιεῖται ὃ ἠδίκησε could hardly in accordance with the genius of the Greek language be regarded as

brachylogical. It denotes (according to the signification of κομίζεσθαι) pretty nearly: *he will reap the wrong;* not that he will suffer the same wrong which he has committed, but its fruits, the reward of it, the wrong in the form of penalty. Cf. Eph. vi. 8. Similar to this are Jno. xii. 5 διὰ τί τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη . . . καὶ ἐδόθη πτωχοῖς; — and (the proceeds) given to the poor (strictly, and in the form of money arising from the sale given to the poor), and 1 Cor. xv. 37. 577 7th ed

c. Acts i. 1 ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας etc., i.e. *what Jesus began*, and consequently continued, *to do and to teach until the day* etc. (vs. 22 ?); much like Luke xxiii. 5 διδάσκων καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἕως ὧδε *beginning from Galilee* and continuing *to this place*, and Matt. xx. 8; Jno. viii. 9; Strabo 12, 541. The construction proposed for these last passages by Fr.: διδάσκων ἕως ὧδε, ἀρξάμ. ἀπὸ τ. Γαλιλ. (Lucian. somn. 15), is too artificial. The assertion of Valckenaer, however, and Kühnöl, that in Acts i. 1 ἄρχεσθαι is pleonastic, seems to be a mere makeshift.

2. Brachylogy appears with especial frequency, and was noticed by the ancient grammarians,

d. in what is called *constructio praegnans* (which connects a preposition with a verb that includes another as consecutive); as, 2 Tim. iv. 18 σώσει εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν *will save me into his kingdom*, i.e. save me, translating me into etc. Acts xxiii. 24; 1 Pet. iii. 20 (Her. 7, 230; Xen. A. 2, 3, 11; Polyb. 8, 11; Lucian. asin. 56 etc., cf. my 5th comment. de verb. compos. p. 9), 2 Tim. ii. 26 ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, Matt. v. 22 ἔνοχος ἔσται εἰς τὴν γέενναν (§ 31, 5 p. 213), Rom. viii. 21 ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης etc. (see Fr. in loc.), Acts v. 37 ἀπέστησε λαὸν ἱκανὸν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ, xx. 30; 2 Cor. xi. 3 μήπως . . . φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἁπλότητος, Acts viii. 40 Φίλ. εὑρέθη εἰς Ἄζωτον (Rom. vii. 10). See, further, Acts xxiii. 11; Luke iv. 38; xviii. 3; Gal. v. 4; Rom. vii. 2; ix. 3 (xv. 28); xvi. 20; 1 Cor. xii. 13; xv. 54; 2 Cor. x. 5; Heb. ii. 3; x. 22; Eph. ii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 15; 1 Pet. iii. 10. According to some, Heb. v. 7 also comes under this head, see Bleek in loc. (Ps. xxii. 22 Hebr.; Ps. cxvii. 5 Sept.); with more certainty Mark vii. 4[1] does. This species of conciseness occurs frequently 644

[1] The passage must be rendered: (on returning) *from the market* (like Arrian. Epict. 3, 19, 5 ἂν μὴ εὕρωμεν φαγεῖν ἐκ βαλανείου), *if they have not washed themselves, they eat not.* To refer βαπτίσωνται to the *food* (as Kühnöl does), would be opposed not so much by the usus loquendi (for βαπτισμός, derived from βαπτίζ., is in vs. 4 obviously

548 in Greek prose, cf. Markland, Eurip. suppl. 1205; Stallb. Plat.
6th ed. Euthyphr. p. 60; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 292 sq.; on the Hebr., however, see Ewald S. 620. Expressions such as *κρύπτειν* or *κλείειν τι ἀπό τινος* (1 Jno. iii. 17), *μετανοεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας* (Acts viii. 22)
578. or *ἐκ τῶν ἔργων* etc. (Rev. ix. 20 f.; xvi. 11), *ἀποβλέπειν* and
7th ed. *ἀφορᾶν εἰς* Heb. xi. 26; xii. 2, *παραλαμβάνειν εἰς* Matt. iv. 5, *ἀσφαλίζεσθαι τοὺς πόδας εἰς τὸ ξύλον* (Acts xvi. 24), *συγκλείειν τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπείθειαν* (Rom. xi. 32), originate in like manner from a constructio praegnans, though by us it is scarcely felt. On *βαπτίζειν τινὰ εἴς τινα*, see Fr. Rom. I. 359. In general, cf. further Fr. Mr. p. 322, also § 50, 4 p. 413 sq.

e. in what is called Zeugma (synizesis), when two nouns are construed with a single verb, though only one of them, the first, directly suits it (cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 429 sq.): 1 Cor. iii. 2 *γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα*, where *ἐπότισα* suits *γάλα* only, and for *βρῶμα* we must educe from this verb the idea *to feed*, cf. Acta apocr. p. 60; Luke i. 64 *ἀνεῴχθη τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ*, where properly *ἐλύθη* (cf. Mark vii. 35) must be understood for *γλῶσσα* (and a few authorities have it), see Raphel in loc.[1] In 1 Tim. iv. 3 *κωλυόντων γαμεῖν, ἀπέχεσθαι βρωμάτων*, the word *κελευόντων* (or with the Scholiast in Matthaei *εἰσηγουμένων*) must be deduced from *κωλ.* (i.q. *κελεύειν μή*) for the latter Inf.; [in the same way in 1 Thess. ii. 8 the simple verb *δοῦναι* from the foregoing compound *μεταδοῦναι* must be supplied with *ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ψυχάς*]. And lastly, 1 Cor. xiv. 34. Cf. Soph. Oed. R. 242; Eurip. Phoen. 1223; Plat. rep. 2, 374 b. (yet see Stallb. in loc.);
645 Protag. p. 327 c.; Demosth. cor. § 55, see Dissen in loc.; Arrian. Al. 7, 15, 5. In Greek authors, sometimes from the first verb must be deduced one of exactly the opposite import for the second member of the sentence, Kühner II. 604; Stallb. Plat. Cratyl. p. 169. This was applied to Jas. i. 9, 10, where it was thought *ταπεινούσθω* (or *αἰσχυνέσθω*)[2] was to be understood with *ὁ δὲ*

applied to *things*), or by the Mid. voice, for this might signify *wash for themselves*, as by the circumstance that in this way a very ordinary thought, and an unexpected one in the connection, is introduced. For, the washing of articles of food brought from the market was not a mere precept of Pharisaism, but a proceeding required by the nature of the case and by the spirit of the Mosaic laws concerning purification.

[1] That *ἀνοίγειν γλῶσσαν* could be employed in plain prose is not proved by what has been adduced by *Segaar* in loc. We may remark also, in passing, that the zeugma usually quoted from Her. 4, 106 disappears in the edition by Schweighäus. in which the text is: *ἐσθῆτα δὲ φορέουσι . . . γλῶσσαν δὲ ἰδίην ἔχουσι.* As, however, there is no MS. authority for *ἔχουσι*, later editors have with reason declined to follow him.

[2] The passage quoted by *Hottinger* in loc. from Plat. rep. 2, 367 d. runs as follows,

πλούσιος. But this is unnecessary; and the thought is finer if καυχάσθω is made to apply also to the second member, see my Observ. in ep. Jac. p. 6. On 1 Cor. vii. 19 see above, § 64, 1 p. 583. For examples of Greek and Latin zeugmata, see d'Orville, Charit. p. 440 sq.; Wyttenb. Plut. moral. I. 189 sq. ed. Lips.; Schaef. Dion. p. 105; Engelhardt, Plat. apol. p. 221; Bremi, exc. 3 ad Lys.; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaest. Lucian. p. 132; Funkhaenel, Demosth. Androt. p. 70; Hand, lat. Styl. p. 424 f.

f. in comparisons (Jacobs, Anthol. pal. III. 63, 494; Achill. Tat. p. 747; Fr. Mr. p. 147), i.e. with the Comparative (cf. § 35, 5 p. 245) and in constructions with adjectives of resemblance, e.g. Rev. xiii. 11 εἶχε κέρατα δύο ὅμοια ἀρνίῳ (properly ἀρνίου κέρασι),[1] as in Iliad. 17, 51 κόμαι Χαρίτεσσιν ὁμοῖαι, Wisd. ii. 15; vii. 3; 2 Pet. i. 1 τοῖς ἰσότιμον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσι πίστιν (for ἰσότ. τῇ ἡμῶν πίστει), Jude 7. Cf. also Xen. Cyr. 5, 1, 3 ὁμοίαν ταῖς δούλαις εἶχε τὴν ἐσθῆτα, 6, 1, 50 ἅρματα ἐκ τοῦ ἱππικοῦ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ ὅμοια ἐκείνῳ (i.e. τοῖς ἐκείνου), Iliad. 1, 163 οὐ μέν σοί ποτε ἴσον ἔχω γέρας (i.e. ἴσον τῷ σῷ), Arrian. Epict. 1, 14, 11; Mtth. 1016. This breviloquence in comparisons is, however, in the Greek authors much more diversified still, see Xen. Cyr. 5, 4, 6; 2, 1, 15; Hier. 1, 38; Isocr. Evag. c. 14; Diod. S. 3, 18; Ael. anim. 4, 21; Dion. H. I. 111; see Wyttenb. Plut. Mor. I. 480 sq.; Schaef. Apollon. Rhod. II. 164; melet. p. 57; Demosth. III. 463; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 153; rep. I. 134, also Heinichen, Euseb. II. 154. In the N. T. under this head come also 1 Jno. iii. 11 f. αὕτη ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους· οὐ καθὼς Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν etc. Strictly, there is nothing to be supplied (ὦμεν or ποιῶμεν would not suit οὐ), but the comparison is expressed carelessly, and the reader easily sets it to rights for himself: *that we love each other, not as Cain was of the wicked one* etc. will, or should, it be with us.[2] 549 6th ed. 579 7th ed. 646

Luke xiii. 1 ὧν τὸ αἷμα Πιλᾶτος ἔμιξε μετὰ τῶν θυσιῶν αὐτῶν (for μετὰ

in the recent editions, agreeably to MS. authority: τοῦτ' οὖν αὐτὸ ἐπαίνεσον δικαιοσύνης, ὃ αὐτὴ δι' αὑτὴν τὸν ἔχοντα ὀνίνησι καὶ ἀδικία βλάπτει; and is thus no longer similar.

[1] Rev. ix. 10 probably does not come under this head. The comparing of tails to scorpions is nearly in the style of the poet, and is sustained by other passages, see vs. 19 and cf. *Züllig* in loc.

[2] Cf. Demosth. Mid. p. 415 a. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ πολιτικῆς αἰτίας, οὐδ' ὥσπερ Ἀριστοφῶν ἀποδοὺς τοὺς στεφάνους ἔλυσε τὴν προβολήν not on account of a political offence, and did not like A. ... quash the proceeding, i.e. nor acting in the way by which A. quashed the impeachment. In opposition to *Reiske*, who would here insert ὅς, see *Spalding* in loc.

τοῦ αἵματος τῶν θ.?) may also be referred to this head, though not necessarily; see Meyer.

3. g. It may be considered as breviloquence also, when a word which should have a clause of its own is directly appended (or even prefixed) to a clause as an apposition; e.g. 2 Tim. ii. 14; Rom. viii. 3 etc. (see § 59, 9 p. 533) and (according to the usual reading) Mark vii. 19 εἰς τὸν ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκπορεύεται, καθαρίζον πάντα τὰ βρώματα. Akin to this is the proleptic use of adjectiva effectus (in a sort of apposition), as in Soph. Oed. Col. 1202 τῶν σῶν ἀδέρκτων ὀμμάτων τητώμενος for ὥστε γενέσθαι ἄδερκτα. This usage is not merely poetic and oratorical, Schaef. Demosth. I. 239; V. 641; Erfurdt, Soph. Antig. 786; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 278; Heller, Soph. Oed. Col. p. 522 sqq., — but is used also in prose, Ast, Plat. legg. p. 150 sq.; Plat. polit. p. 592; Vlc. Fritzsche, quaestion.
550 Lucian. p. 39, 57; Weber, Demosth. 497. See, in general, Meyer
6th ed. de epithet. ornantt. p. 24 and Ahlemeyer Pr. on the poetic prolepsis
580 of the Adject. Paderborn 1827. 4to. From the N. T. might be
7th ed. referred to this head, Matt. xii. 13 (ἡ χεὶρ) ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑγιής (Bornem. schol. p. 39; Stallb. Plat. Protag. p. 76; my Simonis p. 262), Rom. i. 21 ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδία, 2 Cor. iv. 4 θεὸς ἐτύφλωσε τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, 1 Thess. iii. 13 στηρίξαι τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ἀμέμπτους etc., Phil. iii. 21 μετασχηματίσει τὸ σῶμα . . . ἡμῶν σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι etc. (where some Codd. subjoin after ἡμῶν: εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι αὐτό), 1 Cor. i. 8. This construction, however, is hardly admissible, at least in respect to Rom. i. and 2 Cor. iv. In the former passage the import of ἀσύνετος (having reference to ἐματαιώθησαν preceding) is less strong than that of σκοτίζεσθαι (as Flatt perceived), and in 2 Cor. Paul probably conceives of enlightenment as proceeding from a general faith in Christ. Because they did not turn to Christ, but at once rejected him, they did not obtain enlightenment.

With the instances first adduced must be classed also Luke xxiv. 47 ἔδει παθεῖν Χριστὸν . . . καὶ ἀναστῆναι . . . καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ
647 μετάνοιαν, . . . ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ, where the participle (as frequently ἐξόν, παρόν Vig. p. 329) is used absolutely and impersonally: *whilst* (so that) *it was begun*, cf. Her. 3, 91 ἀπὸ δὲ Ποσειδηΐου πόλιος . . . ἀρξάμενον ἀπὸ ταύτης μέχρι Αἰγύπτου . . . πεντήκοντα καὶ τριηκόσια τάλαντα φόρος ἦν, see J. L. Schlosser, vindicat. N. T. locor., quor. integritatem J. Marcland. suspectam reddere non dubitavit (Hamb. 1732. 4to.) p. 18 sq. This English critic (ad Lysiam p. 653, Reiske VI.) wanted to read ἀρξαμένων.

A sort of breviloquence occurs in Acts i. 21 ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ, (ἐν) ᾧ εἰς-

ἦλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς for εἰσῆλθε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐξῆλθε ἀφ' ἡμῶν. But such diffuseness would have been intolerable to every classic author also, cf. Eurip. Phoen. 536 ἐς οἴκους εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἐξῆλθ' (where to be sure the arrangement is more simple) and Valcken. in loc. See also Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 289.

Note. In Acts x. 39 there would in like manner be a brachylogy in the words καὶ ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν ..., ὃν καὶ (the reading according to the best authorities [Cod. Sin. also]) ἀνεῖλον κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου, if the meaning were: *we are witnesses of all that he did, also of this, that they put him to death.* But this acceptation is not necessary. Besides, whatever opinion others may hold, καί here means nothing else than *etiam* (adeo), and the rendering *tamen* (Kühnöl) is in this connection very doubtful. Likewise Luke xxiv. 21 τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον, cf. 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1, could only be regarded as a brachylogy by taking German as the standard. In Greek the numeral was considered simply as a predicative adjunct, cf. Achill. Tat. 7, 11 Jac. τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν γέγονεν ἀφανής, Dion. Hal. IV. 2095 τριακοστὸν ἔτος τοῦτο ἀνεχόμεθα etc. see Bornem. Luc. p. 161 and on analogous cases Krü. 237. Further, there is no brachylogy in 1 Cor. i. 12 ἕκαστος ὑμῶν λέγει· ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλώ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ. In these four 581
statements Paul intended to comprehend all the declarations current in 7th ed.
the church respecting religious partisanship; *each* uses one of the following 551
expressions. Cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 26. Lastly, 1 Cor. vi. 11 ταῦτά τινες ἦτε, 6th ed.
rightly understood, contains no brachylogy, see § 58, 3 p. 513.

4. But the Greek language has a method of blending sentences and parts of sentences so as to give discourse still greater compactness and conciseness, viz. by means of what is called *Attraction* (Bttm. Gr. § 538, 1), which can be termed a species of brachylogy only under one point of view. The name of Attraction, as is well known, has been given by modern grammarians to that mode of expression by means of which two portions of discourse (especially clauses), logically (in sense) connected, are also grammatically (formally) blended. A word (or assemblage of words), which properly belongs to but one of these portions (clauses), is gram- 648
matically extended to the other, and so applies to both at once (to the one clause, logically, and to the other, grammatically), as *urbem, quam statuo, vestra est;* where *urbs* properly belongs to *vestra est* (for there are two propositions: *urbs vestra est*, and *quam statuo*), but is *attracted* by the relative clause and incorporated into it, so as now to belong to both clauses, logically to vestra est, and grammatically to quam statuo. See Hm. Vig. p. 891 sqq.,[1]

[1] *Hm.* as above: Est attractio in eo posita, si quid eo, quod simul ad duas orationis partes refertur, ad quarum alteram non recte refertur, ambas in unam conjungit. Cf.

in particular G. T. A. Krüger, gramm. Untersuch. 3 Theil. The copious diversity of this mode of expression encountered in Greek authors, does not, indeed, occur in the N. T.; yet even there we find not a few instances of attraction which were not recognized as such by the earlier expositors, and which, to say the least, created no small difficulty in interpretation (see e.g. W. Bowyer, Conjectur. I. 147).

5. Attraction in general, so far as it affects the connection of sentences or clauses, may be reduced to three principal sorts: Either, 1. something is attracted from the dependent by the principal clause; or, 2. the principal clause transfers something to the dependent (accessory) clause; or, 3. two clauses, predicated of one and the same subject, are blended into one.

The 1st sort comprehends such constructions as the following:

a. 1 Cor. xvi. 15 *οἴδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ ὅτι ἐστὶν ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας*, Acts ix. 20 *ἐκήρυσσεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*. This is very frequent, when objective clauses follow a verb of observing, knowing, showing, or declaring, as Mark xi. 32; xii. 34; Acts iii. 10; iv. 13; xiii. 32; xv. 36; xvi. 3; xxvi. 5; 1 Cor. iii. 20; xiv. 37; 2 Cor. xii. 3 f.; 1 Thess. ii. 1; 2 Thess.
582 ii. 4; Jno. iv. 35; v. 42; vii. 27; viii. 54 (Arrian. Al. 7, 15, 7);
7th ed. xi. 31; Rev. xvii. 8 (Gen. i. 4; 1 Macc. xiii. 53; 2 Macc. ii. 1; 1 Kings v. 3; xi. 28, etc.). Also when interrogative clauses follow,
552 as Luke iv. 34 *οἶδά σε, τίς εἶ*, Mark i. 24 (see Heupel and Fr. in
6th ed. loc.; Boissonade, Philostr. epp. p. 143), Luke xix. 3 *ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, τίς ἐστι*, cf. Schaef. ind. Aesop. p. 127;[1] Jno. vii. 27 *τοῦτον οἴδαμεν, πόθεν ἐστίν* (Kypke in loc.), Acts xv. 36 *ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφούς . . . πῶς ἔχουσι*, 2 Cor. xiii. 5; Jno. xiii. 28 (Achill. Tat. 1, 19; Theophr. char. 21; Philostr. ep. 64). And the same form of anticipation occurs from clauses with *ἵνα, μή* etc.
649 Col. iv. 17 *βλέπε τὴν διακονίαν, ἵνα αὐτὴν πληροῖς*, Rev. iii. 9 *ποιήσω αὐτούς, ἵνα ἥξουσι*, Gal. vi. 1 *σκοπῶν σεαυτόν, μὴ καὶ σὺ πειρασθῇς*, iv. 11 *φοβοῦμαι ὑμᾶς, μήπως εἰκῇ κεκοπίακα εἰς ὑμᾶς* (cf. Diod. S. 4, 40 *τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐλαβεῖσθαι, μήποτε . . . ἐπίθηται τῇ βασιλείᾳ*, Soph. Oed. R. 760 *δέδοικ' ἐμαυτόν . . . μὴ πόλλ' ἄγαν εἰρημέν' ᾖ μοι*, Thuc. 3, 53; Ignat. ad Rom. I. *φοβοῦμαι τὴν ὑμῶν ἀγάπην, μὴ αὐτή με ἀδικήσῃ*, Varro R. R. 3, 10, 6; Caes. b. gall. 1, 39; cf. Krü. S. 164 f.). In the Passive 1 Cor. xv. 12 *Χριστὸς κηρύσσεται*

Krüg. as above, S. 39 f. Many draw a distinction between assimilation and attraction, cf. *Hand*, Lat. Styl. 376 ff.

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 2 does not come under this head, see § 61, 7 p. 561.

ὅτι ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγήγερται. See, in general, J. A. Lehmann de graec. ling. transp. (Danz. 1832. 4to.) p. 18 sqq.; Schwartz, de soloec. p. 97.[1] As to Hebr. see Gesen. Lgb. 854.

b. Rom. i. 22 φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν, 2 Pet. ii. 21 κρεῖττον ἦν αὐτοῖς μὴ ἐπεγνωκέναι . . . ἢ ἐπιγνοῦσιν ἐπιστρέψαι etc. § 44, 2 p. 320; Kühner II. 355. This sort of attraction has not been adopted in Acts xv. 22, 25 (Elsner, obs. I. 428 sq.); xxvi. 20; Heb. ii. 10; 1 Pet. iv. 3; Luke i. 74; cf. Bremi, Aeschin. fals. leg. p. 196.

c. Acts xvi. 34 ἠγαλλιάσατο πεπιστευκὼς τῷ θεῷ, 1 Cor. xiv. 18 εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ πάντων ὑμῶν μᾶλλον γλώσσαις λαλῶν (var.), see § 45, 4 p. 345.

d. The most simple attraction, but one of very frequent occurrence, is that in which a relative, instead of being put in the case (Acc.) required by the verb of the relative clause, is made to correspond to the verb of the principal clause, and consequently is put in the case governed by it: Jno. ii. 22 ἐπίστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν (for ὅν), see § 24, 1 p. 163.

e. Lastly, under this head would come 1 Pet. iv. 3 ἀρκετὸς ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατειργάσθαι, if, with Wahl, we were to resolve it thus: ἀρκετόν ἐστιν ἡμῖν, τὸν χρόνον . . . κατειργ. cf. Bttm. § 138, 1, 7. But there is no need of such nicety.

On the other hand it should not be said that in Phil. i. 7 δίκαιον ἐμοὶ τοῦτο φρονεῖν etc. attraction is neglected (δίκαιός εἰμι τ. φρον.) Mtth. 756, for the Greeks also use δίκαιόν ἐστι with the Infin. impersonally; only they are less accustomed to connect with it the Dat. of the person, than to connect the personal word with the Infin. and put it in the Acc. Her. 1, 39. The former is the more simple and natural construction.

2) The simplest form in which a subordinate clause exerts an attraction on the principal clause is when the relative pronoun, which should agree in number and gender with the noun of the principal clause, agrees in these respects with the noun of the subordinate clause; as, 1 Tim. iii. 15 ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία, Rom. ix. 24 (σκεύη ἐλέους) οὓς καὶ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς. In the following cases the attraction is carried still farther: 583 7th ed.

[1] *Anticipation* is properly to be admitted only when the author applied beforehand to the subject the subsequent predication in the accessory clause. On the contrary, particularly when parenthetic clauses intervene, e.g. Acts xv. 36 the construction ἐπισκεψώμεθα τοὺς ἀδελφούς may at first have been alone intended, and πῶς ἔχουσιν subjoined merely for further explanation.

650 a. 1 Cor. x. 16 *τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος* etc., Jno. vi. 29 *ἵνα πιστεύσητε εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος*, see § 24, 2 a. pp. 164, 166, or Mark vi. 16 *ὃν ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα Ἰωάννην, οὗτός ἐστιν*, see § 24, 2 b. p. 164, cf. Matt. vii. 9.

b. 1 Jno. ii. 25 *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία, ἣν αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον* for *ζωή* in apposition to *ἐπαγγελία* 553 (see § 59, 7 p. 530), Philem. 10 f.; Rom. iv. 24 *ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς, οἷς* 6th ed. *μέλλει λογίζεσθαι τοῖς πιστεύουσιν* etc. (Rev. xvii. 8 var. ?). Luther understood Phil. iii. 18 also thus. Cf. further, Fr. Mr. 328; Stallb. Plat. rep. I. 216; II. 146; Kühn. II. 515.

c. Matt. x. 25 *ἀρκετὸν τῷ μαθητῇ, ἵνα γένηται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ δοῦλος ὡς ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ* for *καὶ τῷ δούλῳ* (*ἵνα γέν.*) *ὡς ὁ κύρ.* etc.

d. Rom. iii. 8 *τί ἔτι ἐγὼ ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κρίνομαι; καὶ μή, καθὼς βλασφημούμεθα καὶ καθὼς φασί τινες ἡμᾶς λέγειν, ὅτι ποιήσωμεν τὰ κακά, ἵνα* etc., where the apostle ought to have made *ποιεῖν κακά* etc. dependent on *καὶ μή*, but, misled by the parenthesis, appends it to *λέγειν* in oratio recta. The same construction occurs not unfrequently in Greek authors, particularly in connection with a relative clause, see Hm. Vig. 743; Krüg. Unters. 457 ff.; Dissen, Dem. cor. 177, and on the Latin usage, Beier, Cic. off. I. 50 sq.; Grotefend, ausf. Gr. 462 f.

3) Two interrogative clauses following one another as predicates of one and the same subject are blended into one; as, Acts xi. 17 *ἐγὼ δὲ τίς ἤμην δυνατὸς κωλῦσαι τὸν θεόν; but I, who was I? had I power to withstand God?* Cf. Cic. N. D. 1, 27, 78 quid censes, si ratio esset in belluis, non suo quasque generi plurimum tributuras fuisse? Luke xix. 15 *τίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο;* Mark xv. 24 *τίς τί ἄρῃ;* see Hm. Soph. Aj. 1164; Eurip. Io 807; Lob. Soph. Aj. 454 sq.; Ellendt, lexic. Soph. II. 824; Weber, Demosth. p. 348 (as to Latin, Grotefend, ausf. Gram. II. 96; Kritz, Sallust. I. 211). For other modes of blending interrogative clauses by attraction, see Kühner II. 588 f. An interrogative and a relative clause are blended in Luke xvi. 2 *τί τοῦτο ἀκούω περὶ σοῦ;* quid est quod de te audio, see Bornem. in loc. Similar is Acts xiv. 15 *τί ταῦτα ποιεῖτε;*

Luke i. 73 also I consider as an attraction: *μνησθῆναι διαθήκης ἁγίας αὐτοῦ, ὅρκον* (for *ὅρκου*) *ὃν ὤμοσε* etc. Others, as Kühnöl, find here a double construction of *μνησθῆναι*, which in the Sept. is also construed with the Acc. Gen. ix. 16; Exod. xx. 8, — a view previously adopted by an 651 anonymous writer in the Alt. und Neu. for 1735. S. 336 f. 2 Pet. ii. 12

ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσι βλασφημοῦντες is probably to be resolved: ἐν τούτοις, ἃ 584
ἀγνοοῦσι, βλασφ. A similar construction, βλασφ. εἴς τινα, is of frequent 7th ed.
occurrence (§ 32, 1 p. 222), cf. חֵרַף בְּ 2 Sam. xxiii. 9, קִלֵּל בְּ Isa. viii. 21 (to which perhaps may be compared also μυκτηρίζειν ἔν τινι 3 Esr. i. 49; see, on the other hand, 2 Chron. xxxvi. 16), though ἀγνοεῖν ἔν τινι also is not without example in later writers; see Fabricii Pseudepigr. II. 717.

6. But attraction is also confined to a single clause. In this case it is especially noticeable that two local prepositions are blended into one, and thus the clause gains in terseness (Hm. Vig. 893), Luke xi. 13 ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον for ὁ πατὴρ ὁ ἐν οὐρανῷ δώσει ἐξ οὐρανοῦ πν. ἅγ., [Matt. xxiv. 17 τὰ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ for τὰ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας,] Col. iv. 16 τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἐπιστολὴν ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε (not the letter written from Laodicea, but) the letter written *to* Laodicea and sent again *from* Laodicea.[1] Cf. besides, Luke ix. 61 (Mark v. 26). 554
So too with adverbs of place, as an instance of which may be 6th ed.
considered Luke xvi. 26 οἱ ἐκεῖθεν (Franke, Demosth. p. 13). With passages of the former class may also be numbered Heb. xiii. 24 ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας (i.e. οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας); yet it might be also rendered: *those from Italy*, the Italian Christians (who were with the writer of the letter). A critical argument concerning the place where the letter was written should never have been found in these words. On the other hand 2 Cor. ix. 2 and Phil. iv. 22 are also intelligible without assuming an attraction. Such condensed expression is very frequent in Greek authors, cf. Xen. Cyr. 7, 2, 5 ἁρπασόμενοι τὰ ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν, Thuc. 2, 80 ἀδυνάτων ὄντων ξυμβοηθεῖν τῶν ἀπὸ θαλάσσης Ἀκαρνάνων, Demosth. Phil. III. 46 etc. τοὺς ἐκ Σερρίου τείχους . . . στρατιώτας ἐξέβαλεν, Paus. 4, 13, 1 ἀποῤῥίψαι τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης, Demosth. Timocr. 483 b.; Xen. An. 1, 2, 18; Plat. apol. p. 32 b.; Thuc. 3, 5; 7, 70; Lucian. eunuch. 12; Theophr. char. 2; Xen. Eph. 1, 10; Isocr. ep. 7 p. 1012 (Judith viii. 17; Sus. 26). See Fischer, Plat. Phaed. p. 318 sq.; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 119; Hm. Soph. Electr. 135 and Aeschyl. Agam. vs. 516; Ast, Theophr. char. p. 61; Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 176 sq.; III. II. 389; Weber, Demosth. 191, 446.

7. On the other hand, sometimes a clause is grammatically 652
resolved into two, which are connected by καί: Rom. vi. 17 χάρις

[1] Ignorance of the frequency of this usage has determined several expositors, in spite of the context, to adhere to the translation *the epistle* (written by Paul) *from Laodicea*.

τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ὑπηκούσατε δέ etc. (for which ὄντες ποτὲ δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑπηκούσατε ἐκ καρδίας might have
585 been used),[1] Luke xxiv. 18 σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἰερουσαλ. καὶ οὐκ
7th ed. ἔγνως, where, in a language to which the participial construction is peculiarly congenial, it would have been more correct to say: σὺ μόνος παροικῶν Ἰερ. οὐκ ἔγνως, Matt. xi. 25 probably also 1 Cor. iv. 4. See Fr. Mt. pp. 287, 413; Gesen. on Isa. v. 4. Cf. with this, what Bttm. § 136, 1 has remarked on clauses connected by μέν and δέ; and as to parataxis in general, Kühner II. 415 f. In some of these passages, however, the former construction may have been adopted with the design of giving to the first clause its full prominence. This becomes still more apparent from Jno. iii. 19 αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ κρίσις, ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος etc., see BCrus. and in particular Lücke in loc., cf. also vi. 50. Thus also John in vii. 4 οὐδείς τι ἐν κρυπτῷ ποιεῖ καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ εἶναι prefers to combine in parallelism the two irreconcilable acts (nobody does both at the same time), than to write οὐδεὶς . . . ποιεῖ ζητῶν αὐτός etc. On Matt. xviii. 21 see above, § 45, note 2 p. 355. But in 1 Pet. iv. 6 the two clauses dependent on ἵνα are to be regarded as co-ordinate; only in this connection κρίνεσθαι must be understood correctly.

555 Corresponding to this idiom, only more limited, would be the figure of
6th ed. speech ἓν διὰ δυοῖν (hendiadys), by which instead of *one* substantive with an adjective or Genitive (of quality) *two* substantives are used, the quality of the thing being thus for the sake of emphasis raised to a grammatical equality with the thing itself: pateris libamus et auro, i.e. pateris aureis. This is substantially an appositive relation: pateris et quidem auro, pat. h. e. auro, see Fr. exc. 4 ad Mt.; Teipel in the Archiv f. d. Stud. d. neuern Sprachen 10 Bd. 1 Heft. For a more exact view of the subject, see C. F. Müller in Schneidewin, Philol. VII. 297 ff. Expositors have in fact asserted the existence of this figure in the N. T. (Glass. philol. sacra I. 18 sq.), and some of them in the most unmeasured and injudicious terms (Heinrichs), e.g. Matt. iii. 11; Acts xiv. 13; Jno. i. 14; iii. 5; Heb. vi. 10. But even a sifted collection of examples (Wilke, Rhet. S. 149) does not furnish one that is unquestionable. Either the two notions connected together are really distinct, as in 2 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Pet. i. 16; or the second

[1] Others, as finally *Fr.* also, lay the stress on the Preterite ἦτε, *that ye* WERE (that this is past); and this exposition may urge the position of ἦτε in its favor. But on this interpretation Paul would at any rate have expressed himself somewhat artificially, since ἦτε primarily designates their state only as having formerly existed, not from the present point of view as terminated, (ye *were* servants, not ye *have been*).

substantive is epexegetical (consequently, supplementary), as in (Rom. 653
i. 5) Acts i. 25; xxiii. 6; Eph. vi. 18, cf. also 2 Cor. viii. 4 (*καί and indeed, namely* p. 437 c.), — a construction which, even though of the same genus with hendiadys, is of a different species. (Interpreters have wholly erred in wanting to find a hendiadys in the verb also, e.g. Phil. iv. 18.)

§ 67. ABNORMAL RELATION OF INDIVIDUAL WORDS IN A SENTENCE (HYPALLAGE). 586 7th ed.

1. Occasionally an irregularity may be noticed in the relation of individual words in a sentence. This occurs sometimes as constructio ad sensum (very frequent in Greek authors), — an irregularity which, to the reader who attentively observes the connection, cannot render the meaning either difficult or doubtful; at other times it may be characterized as an inadvertence on the part of the writer, who, busied with his thoughts, disregards accuracy of expression.

We notice,

a. The constructio ad sensum (*πρὸς τὸ σημαινόμενον* or *κατὰ σύνεσιν*), examples of which have already been adduced in connection with the predicate and attributive § 58, and in connection with the pronouns § 21 (cf. also Rev. iii. 4).

b. The subject is omitted, and has to be *indirectly* supplied from the preceding context: 1 Cor. vii. 36 *γαμείτωσαν* viz. the two young persons who have associated together; as inferred from the preceding mention of a marriageable daughter. In Gal. i. 23 *μόνον ἀκούοντες ἦσαν* the notion of church *members* is to be gathered from *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις* vs. 22 (cf. Caes. gall. 4, 14). There would be a similar instance in 1 Tim. ii. 15, if in *ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει* the word *τέκνα* were to be supplied from *τεκνογονίας* preceding. This is grammatically admissible, cf. Plat. legg. 10 p. 886 d., where *γενόμενοι* is referred to *θεογονίαν*, as if the expression *θεῶν γένεσις* had been employed, see Zell, Aristot. ethic. p. 209; Poppo, Xen. Cyr. p. 29, 160; Küster (Reisig) Xen. Oecon. p. 247 sq., yet see above, § 58, 4 p. 516. In 1 Tim. v. 4 probably 556
for *μανθανέτωσαν* the subject *χῆραι* is to be deduced from the 6th ed.
collective *τὶς χήρα*, see Huther in loc., as a Plur. often refers to 654
τίς (Rev. xiv. 11), see Herbst, Xen. mem. p. 50. On the other hand, in Rom. xiii. 6 *λειτουργοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν* refers to *οἱ ἄρχοντες* vs. 3.

c. Sometimes there is a sudden change of subject: Jno. xix. 4 f. *ἐξῆλθεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Πιλᾶτος καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· Ἴδε ἄγω ὑμῖν*

αὐτὸν ἔξω . . . ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω . . . καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς viz. Pilate, cf. xix. 38; Luke xix. 4 *προδραμὼν . . . ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν (Ζακχαῖος), ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτόν (Ἰησοῦν), ὅτι ἐκείνης ἤμελλε (Ἰησοῦς) διέρχεσθαι*, cf. xiv. 5; xv. 15; xvii. 2; Mark ix. 20; Acts vi. 6; x. 4; Rom. x. 14 f.; Judith v. 8. On 1 Jno. v. 16, see § 58, 9 p. 523. In Greek prose authors this transition from one subject to another is not uncommon: Her. 6, 30 *ὁ δὲ* (Histiaeus) *οὔτ' ἂν ἔπαθε κακὸν οὐδέν, δοκέειν ἐμοί, ἀπῆκέ* (Darius) *τ' ἂν αὐτῷ τὴν αἰτίην*, Demosth. c. Phorm. p. 587 a. *ὃς οὐκ ἔφασκεν οὔτε τὰ χρήματα ἐντεθεῖσθαι τοῦτον* (Phormion), *οὔτε τὸ χρυσίον ἀπειληφέναι* (Lampis),
587 Plutarch. Poplic. compar. 5 . . . *προσέλαβεν* (Poplicola) *ὅσα δόντα*
7th ed. *ἀγαπητὸν ἦν νικῆσαι· καὶ γὰρ τὸν πόλεμον διέλυσε* (Porsena) etc., vit. Lysand. 24 *ἄλλο δ' οὐδὲν ἐχρήσατο* (Agesil.) *αὐτῷ πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον· ἀλλὰ τοῦ Χρόνου διελθόντος ἀπέπλευσεν* (Lysand.) *εἰς τὴν Σπάρτην* etc., Ages. 40 *τὴν βασιλείαν Ἀρχίδαμος . . . παρέλαβε, καὶ* (sc. *αὕτη*) *διέμεινε τῷ γένει*, Artax. 15 *τοῦ κροτάφου τυχὼν κατέβαλον τὸν ἄνδρα, καὶ τέθνηκεν* (*οὗτος*) etc., Lysias caed. Eratosth. 10 *ἵνα τὸν τιτθὴν αὐτῷ* (*παιδίῳ*) *διδῷ καὶ μὴ βοᾷ* (*τὸ παιδ.*). Cf. Poppo, observ. in Thuc. p. 189; Schaef. Demosth. IV. 214 and Plutarch. IV. 281, 331; V. 86, 295; Stallb. Plat. Gorg. 215; Maetzner, Antiphon 145; Schoem. Is. 294. As to Hebrew usage, see Gesen. Lgb. 803.

d. Words referring to something antecedent are used in a loose reference. On *αὐτός* see § 22, 3 p. 145 sq. So in Gal. ii. 2 *αὐτοῖς* refers to *Ἱεροσόλυμα* vs. 1, but the inhabitants are meant. Similarly in Acts xvii. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 4 *αὐτοῦ* is to be understood of Christ, who has not been expressly named, but is intimated in *παρουσία*. In Jno. xv. 6 *αὐτά* refers to the Sing. *τὸ κλῆμα*, which is in apposition to *εἴ τις*. In Acts iv. 7 *αὐτούς*, in a different way, refers, not to *αὐτῶν* vs. 5, but to vss. 1 and 2. In Acts x. 7 *αὐτῷ* refers, not to Simon vs. 6, but to Cornelius vss. 1–5, as is indicated even by some MSS., which read *τῷ Κορνηλίῳ*, a manifest gloss. In Acts vii. 24 *πατάξας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον*, no Egyptian had been previously mentioned; the *ἀδικῶν* is merely hinted in *ἀδικούμενον*, and that he was an Egyptian is assumed as known from the connection. Lastly, in 2 Jno. 7 *οὗτος* refers to *πολλοὶ πλάνοι*, and sums up in one person the plurality. Vice versa, in 1 Jno. iv. 4 *αὐτούς* refers to *ἀντιχρίστου* vs. 3. The reference of *αὐτοῦ* in Jno.
655 xx. 7, of *αὐτόν* vs. 15, and of *ἐκεῖνοι* Jno. vii. 45 to the nearest subject, is more simple, see p. 157. It is an inaccuracy of construction also when a pronoun, especially a relative, serves in a

single form for two cases 1 Cor. ii. 9 ἃ ὀφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρ. οὐκ ἀνέβη Sept. Fundamentally this falls under the class of constructions treated of in § 64, I. 1 p. 581 sqq. The like occurs frequently in Latin also, Kritz, Sallust. I. p. 67 ; II. p. 295 sq.

e. Of two parallel members of a sentence, the first is sometimes expressed in such terms as to appear to comprehend the second, though from the nature of the case that is impossible: Acts xxvii. 22 ἀποβολὴ 557
ψυχῆς οὐδεμία ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν πλὴν τοῦ πλοίου would literally mean: *there* 6th ed.
shall be no loss of life except of the ship ; instead of which should have been said: there shall be no loss of life, only loss of the ship. Similar is Gal. i. 19 ἕτερον τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον, εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου, if, with Fr. Matt. p. 482, we choose to render it: *alium apostolum non vidi, sed vidi Jacobum* etc., that is, so that it would be necessary 588
merely to repeat εἶδον with Ἰάκ. ; yet see my Comment. and Mey. in loc.[1] 7th ed.
Nearly the same use of εἰ μή occurs in Rev. xxi. 27 οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ ... πᾶν κοινὸν καὶ ὁ ποιῶν βδέλυγμα ... εἰ μὴ οἱ γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς, where the γεγραμμένοι are not to be counted under πᾶν κοινόν. The meaning is rather: *nothing profane shall enter ; only they who are written* etc. *shall enter*, ix. 4. Cf. 1 Kings iii. 18 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐθεὶς μεθ' ἡμῶν παρὲξ ἀμφοτέρων ἡμῶν ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ.

2. The very structure of the sentence has been disturbed by the inadvertence of the writer in Luke xxiv. 27 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διηρμήνευεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ αὑτοῦ. Here it can hardly be assumed that to Moses and the prophets are opposed certain other books of the O. T. to which Jesus passed, nor, with Kühnöl, that Jesus first quoted the statements of the prophets, then, as a separate proceeding, began to interpret them (see van Hengel, annot. p. 104) ; but probably Luke meant to say: Jesus, beginning *from* (*with*) Moses, went through *all the prophets;* see also BCrus. in loc. Instead of this, having ἀπό in mind, he annexes πάντες προφῆται in the Genitive. Meyer's device is unsatisfactory. In connection with this passage may be taken Acts iii. 24 πάντες οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν etc. Luke might have said, *all the prophets*, *Samuel* (as the first) *and all his successors* (in order) etc., or, *all the prophets from Samuel downwards*, *as many of them* etc. As the words now stand, they

[1] In Heb. xii. 25 εἰ ἐκεῖνοι οὐκ ἐξέφυγον ... πολὺ μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς etc. those who (Kühnöl also) render πολὺ μᾶλλον by multo minus repeat for the apodosis ἐκφευξόμεθα alone. But the phrase retains its signification multo magis, and the entire negative notion οὐκ ἐκφευξ. is to be repeated after it. Cf. Caes. gall. 1, 47.

656 contain an unmistakable tautology. For even the division, proposed by Casaubon and adopted by a host of expositors (including Valckenaer), τῶν καθ. ὅσοι ἐλάλ. does not help the passage essentially. Still we have *all the prophets from Samuel on*, and then, as if not already included in the foregoing, *the whole succession that followed Samuel and prophesied.* The expedient that van Hengel (as above, p. 103) suggests, supplying ἕως Ἰωάννου
558 (Matt. xi. 13), is arbitrary, and gives only the equally inappropri-
6th ed. ate sense: *from Samuel and the succeeding prophets . . . to John*, whilst it was to be expected that two boundaries of this series would be mentioned. Hengel thus gains at last merely Luke's brachylogy (already explained p. 621): ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ . . . ἕως.

3. Formerly critics went much farther in discovering such inaccuracies resulting from inadvertence. Namely,

a. A false reference of the attributive to the substantive, affecting
589 the grammatical form of the former, was thought to exist not
7th ed. only in Acts v. 20 τὰ ῥήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης (for ταῦτα), Rom. vii. 24 see above, p. 237 sq., but also (Bengel on Luke xxii. 20; Bauer, Philol. Thucyd. Paul. p. 263) Eph. ii. 2 κατὰ τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ ἀέρος, τοῦ πνεύματος etc. instead of τὸ πνεῦμα, iii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 7; Luke viii. 32; xxii. 20; and this supposed species of hypallage[1] was supported by examples from ancient authors. In a sentence of some length, containing a variety of relations, such inaccuracy, especially on the part of an unpractised writer, would be quite possible. In the poets also passages might be pointed out, which without some such assumption admit of only a forced interpretation, cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 73 sq.; Hm. Vig. 891 and Soph. Philoct. p. 292 and Eurip. Hel. p. 7; Krüger, grammat. Untersuch. III. 37 f. But in prose such instances are extremely rare (Poppo, Thuc. I. I. 161; Bornem. Xen. Anab. p. 206; Heinichen, Euseb. II. 175); in the N. T. there is not a single one that is unquestionable, see F. Woken, pietas crit. in hypallagas bibl. Viteb. 1718. 8vo. Luke viii. 32 disposes of itself. As to Eph. iii. 2, see my Progr. de Hypallage et Hendiadyi in N. T. libris. Erlang. 1824. 4to. p. 15 and Harless in loc. In Eph. ii. 2, where the apostle might most easily have strayed from the correct construction, πνεῦμα is that spirit which pervades and rules men of the world, and of which Satan is regarded as the lord and master, see Mey. in loc. Heinichen, Euseb. II. 99, insists on the

[1] Cf. *Glass.* philol. sacr. I. 652 sqq.; Jani, ars [illegible]t. p. 258 sqq. On the other hand, cf. *Elster*, de Hypallage. Helmst. 1845. 4to.

existence of hypallage. In 2 Cor. iii. 7 *εἰ ἡ διακονία τοῦ θανάτου* 657
ἐν γράμμασιν ἐντετυπωμένη ἐν λίθοις, Paul might in contrast with *διακονία τοῦ πνεύματος* have said with greater simplicity: *ἡ διακονία τοῦ γράμματος ἐντετυπωμένου ἐν λίθοις*. But the present connection of the words is not incorrect. Moses' *ministry* of death was in so far itself *ἐν λίθοις ἐντετυπωμένη*, as it consisted in communicating laws threatening and inflicting death, and in administering them among the people. The letter of the law contained the ministry which Moses had to execute. Moreover, there is a grammatical resemblance between this passage and Tac. annal. 14, 16 quod species ipsa carminum docet, non impetu et instinctis nec ore uno *fluens*. In Heb. ix. 10 *ἐπικείμενα* is certainly not construed with *δικαιώμασι* instead of *ἐπικειμένοις*, but *δικαιώμασι* is in apposition to *ἐπὶ βρώμασιν* etc., and *ἐπικείμενα* corresponds to *μὴ δυνάμεναι*, the neuter being selected because both, *δῶρα καὶ θυσίαι*, are here included. According to the other reading, *δικαιώματα*, which is well supported [by Cod. Sin. also], 559
ἐπικείμενα can be referred to that appositive word quite regularly. 6th ed.
There is more appearance of irregular reference in Luke xxii. 20, where *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον* might have been construed with *ἐν τῷ αἵματι*. But it is not probable that in so short a sentence 590
Luke should have employed *ἐκχυνόμενον* from inadvertence. It is 7th ed.
more likely that, as he had connected *διδόμενον* with *σῶμα*, he joined *ἐκχυν.* to *ποτήριον*, meaning the contents of the cup, and this metonymy is easier still than the other, *τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη*. This anomaly is obviously not of a grammatical, but of a logical kind, (although *to pour out a cup* may be said with entire correctness). Yet Schulthess (on the Lord's Supper, S. 155 f.) need not have grown so warm over the matter. In Heb. vi. 1 even Kühnöl has rejected the hypallage, alleged by Palairet and others. On Jno. i. 14 *πλήρης χάριτος* etc. see § 62, 3 p. 564, and on 2 Cor. xi. 28 and Rev. i. 5, § 59, 8 pp. 532, 533. In 2 Cor. iv. 17 *αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης* cannot be taken for *αἰωνίου βαρ. δόξης*, for the reason that this would destroy the harmonious arrangement at which the apostle manifestly aimed (*παραυτίκα, αἰώνιον, ἐλαφρόν, βάρος, θλίψις, δόξα*). On 1 Cor. iv. 3 see Meyer against Billroth and Rückert. In Acts xi. 5 *εἶδον καταβαῖνον σκεῦός τι, ὡς ὀθόνην μεγάλην, τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιεμένην* etc. must not be regarded as an hypallage, on being compared with x. 11 (*καθιέμενον*); the participles may be referred with equal propriety to *σκεῦος* or to *ὀθόνη*. It is difficult to decide on 2 Cor. xii. 21 *μή ... πενθήσω*

πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων etc. We
658 naturally ask, why not *all* impenitent sinners? Did Paul intend to say: τοὺς μὴ μετανοήσαντας? As, however, in vs. 21 a different class of sins is named from that in vs. 20, we may, with Mey., conclude that the προημαρτηκότες are more closely characterized by μὴ μετανοησάντ. as those that have remained impenitent only in reference to sins of sensuality, mentioned immediately after.

b. Akin to hypallage is antiptosis, which some (including Kühnöl) find in Heb. ix. 2 πρόθεσις ἄρτων, as if for ἄρτοι προθέσεως (cf. as to this remarkable figure Hm. Vig. p. 890; Soph. Electr. p. 8; Blomfield, Aeschyl. Agamemn. 148, 1360; Wyttenb. Plat. Phaed. p. 232), nearly as the following passages have been understood: Plotin. Enn. 2, 1 p. 97 g. πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τοῦ ἀποτελέσματος ὑπάρχειν προσήκει for πρὸς τὸ τοῦ βουλήματος ἀποτέλεσμα, or Thuc. 1, 6 οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τῶν εὐδαιμόνων for οἱ εὐδαίμονες τῶν πρεσβ. (see Scholiasts). But that N. T. passage is to be rendered quite simply: *the exposition of loaves* (the sacred usage of laying out loaves). Valcken. even wants to take ἡ τράπεζα καὶ ἡ πρόθ. ἄρτ. for ἡ τράπ. τῶν ἄρτων τῆς προθ. Lastly, it is altogether wrong to take, as do some (including Bengel), διώκων νόμον δικαιοσύνης in Rom. ix. 31 for δικαιοσύνην νόμου, see Fr. in loc. In reference to other alleged incongruities of this description, cf. the instructive 1st Exc. of Fr. on Mark, p. 759 sqq.

560 § 68. REGARD TO SOUND IN THE STRUCTURE OF SENTENCES; 6th ed. PARONOMASIA AND PLAY UPON WORDS (ANNOMINATIO), PAR-
591 ALLELISM, VERSE. 7th ed.

1. The general euphony of the N. T. style (in which cacophony but rarely appears, 1 Cor. xii. 2, cf. Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 105 and paralip. p. 53 sq.) was not for the most part the result of design. Only, in regard to paronomasia and annominatio, many instances may have been intentional. Paronomasia,[1] which as is well known consists in the combination of words of similar sound, and is one of the favorite fancies of Oriental writers,[2] is peculiarly frequent in the Epistles of Paul, partly, it should seem, accidentally, and partly studied by the writer in his desire to impart genial liveliness

[1] See *Glassii* philol. sacr. I. 1335–1342; *Ch. B. Michaelis*, de paronomas. sacra. Hal. 1737. 4to., also *Lob.* paralip. 501 sqq. A solid and exhaustive monograph is *J. F. Böttcher's* de paronomasia finitimisque ei figuris Paulo Ap. frequentatis. Lips. 1823. 8vo

[2] See *Verschuir*, dissertat. philol. exeg. p. 172 sqq.

to the expression, or greater emphasis to the thought; as, Luke xxi. 11 *καὶ λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται* (cf. the German *Hunger und Kummer*), Hesiod. opp. 226; Plutarch. Coriol. c. 13, see Valcken. in loc.; Acts xvii. 25 *ζωὴν καὶ πνοήν* (cf. the German *leben und weben*, *Hülle und Fülle*, *Saus und Braus*, *rädern und ädern*, Varr. R. R. 3, 2, 13 utrum propter *oves*, an propter *aves*, see Baiter, Isocr. Paneg. p. 117); Heb. v. 8 *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν* (seine Leiden leiteten ihn zum Gehorsam, cf. Her. 1, 207), see Wetst. and Valcken. in loc.; Rom. xi. 17 *τινὲς τῶν κλάδων ἐξεκλάσθησαν.* Thus, in a series of words, the paronomastic are placed next to each other, as in Rom. i. 29, 31 (*πορνείᾳ, πονηρίᾳ*) *φθόνου, φόνου . . . ἀσυνέτους, ἀσυνθέτους* (Wetst. in loc.). In other passages words of similar derivation are placed together; as, 1 Cor. ii. 13 *ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος, πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες*, 2 Cor. viii. 22 *ἐν πολλοῖς πολλάκις σπουδαῖον*, ix. 8 *ἐν παντὶ πάντοτε πᾶσαν αὐτάρκειαν*, Acts xxiv. 3; 2 Cor. x. 12 *αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μετροῦντες*, Rom. viii. 23 *αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν*, Phil. i. 4 (Xen. mem. 3, 12, 6 *δυσκολία καὶ μανία πολλάκις πολλοῖς . . . ἐμπίπτουσιν*, 4, 4, 4 *πολλῶν πολλάκις ὑπὸ τῶν δικαστῶν ἀφιεμένων*, An. 2, 4, 10 *αὐτοὶ ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἐχώρουν*, 2, 5, 7 *πάντη γὰρ πάντα τοῖς θεοῖς ὕποχα καὶ παντα χῆ πάντων ἴσον οἱ θεοὶ κρατοῦσι*, Polyb. 6, 18, 6; Athen. 8, 352; Arrian. Epict. 3, 23, 22; Synes. prov. 2, p. 116 b. *πάντα παντα χοῦ πάντων κακῶν ἔμπλεα ἦν*, see Krü. Xen. An. 1, 9, 2; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 138, 380; Boisson. Nicet. 243; Beier, Cic. off. 592
I. 128; Jahn, Archiv II. 402). Matt. xxi. 41 *κακοὺς κακῶς* 7th ed.
ἀπολέσει αὐτούς he will miserably destroy those miserable fellows (Demosth. Mid. 413 b. *εἶτα θαυμάζεις, εἰ κακὸς κακῶς ἀπολῇ*, adv. Zenoth. 575 c.; Aristophan. Plut. 65, 418; Diog. L. 2, 76; Alciphr. 3, 10; cf. also Aeschyl. Pers. 1041; Plaut. Aulular. 1, 1, 3 sq. and Schaef. Soph. Electr. 742; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 471 and 561
paralip. 8, 56 sqq.; Foertsch, de locis Lysiae p. 44).[1] 6th ed.

Writers occasionally use strange or uncommon words, or forms, for the purpose of producing a paronomasia (Gesenius LG. S. 858) e.g. Gal. v. 7 *πείθεσθαι . . . ἡ πεισμονή* (see my Comment. in loc.), cf. die Bisthümer sind verwandelt in Wüstthümer, die Abteien

[1] See also *Doederlein*, Progr. de brachylogia p. 8 sq. Especially a large collection of such paronomastic combinations will be found in *E. A. Diller*, Progr. de consensu notionum qualis est in vocibus ejusd. originis diversitate formarum copulatis. Misen. 1842. 4to.

660 sind nun — Raubteien (Schiller in Wallenstein's Lager), Verbesserungen nicht Verböserungen.[1]

2. Annominatio is akin to paronomasia, but differs from it in this: that it adds to a regard for the sound of words, a regard to their meaning also (as, in German: Träume sind Schäume); consequently for the most part it consists of antitheses, e.g. Matt. xvi. 18 *σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω* etc., Rom. v. 19 *ὥσπερ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτω καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται*, i. 20 *τὰ ἀόρατα αὐτοῦ . . . καθορᾶται*, Phil. iii. 2 f. *βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν, ἡμεῖς γάρ ἐσμεν ἡ περιτομή* (Diog. L. 6, 24 *τὴν Εὐκλείδου σχολὴν ἔλεγε χολήν, τὴν δὲ Πλάτωνος διατριβὴν κατατριβήν*), iii. 12; 2 Cor. iv. 8 *ἀπορούμενοι, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐξαπορούμενοι*, 2 Thess. iii. 11 *μηδὲν ἐργαζομένους, ἀλλὰ περιεργαζομένους* (cf. Seidler, Eurip. Troad. p. 11), 2 Cor. v. 4 *ἐφ' ᾧ οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι*, Acts viii. 30 *ἆρά γε γινώσκεις, ἃ ἀναγινώσκεις;* Jno. ii. 23 f. *πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς*, Rom. i. 28; iii. 3; xi. 17; xii. 3; xvi. 2; Eph. i. 23; iii. 14, 19; Gal. iv. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 17; vi. 2; xi. 29, 31; xiv. 10; 2 Cor. iii. 2; v. 21; x. 3; 1 Tim. i. 8 f.; 2 Tim. iii. 4; iv. 7; 3 Jno. 7 f.; Rev. xxii. 18 f. [Matt. vi. 16]. In Philem. 20 the allusion in *ὀναίμην* to the name of the slave
593 *Ὀνήσιμος*[2] is less obvious. Moreover, the same remark made
7th ed. above respecting strange words may be repeated here, and is per-
562 haps applicable to Gal. v. 12; cf. my Comment. in loc., and also
6th ed.

[1] In the Agenda of Duke Henry of Saxony, 1539, it is said in the preface respecting the Popish parson: sein Sorge ist nicht *Seel*sorge, sondern *Meel*sorge.

[2] An annominatio in which regard is had *solely* to the meaning occurs in Philem. 11 *Ὀνήσιμον τὸν ποτέ σοι ἄχρηστον, νυνὶ δὲ σοὶ καὶ ἐμοὶ εὔχρηστον* etc. Still more latent would be the annominatio in 1 Cor. i. 23: *κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, ἔθνεσι δὲ μωρίαν, αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς . . . σοφίαν*, where Paul is said to have had in view the words מַכְשׁוֹל *σκάνδαλον*, סָכָל *stultus*, and שֵׂכֶל *sapientia* (*Glassii* philol. I. 1339). I am not aware, however, of such a word as מַשְׁכָּל in Chaldaic; and it is only in Aethiopic that משקל signifies *cross*. The whole statement is an instance of learned trifling. Equally improbable is Jerome's conjecture on Gal. i. 6, that in *μετατίθεσθε* the apostle makes an allusion to the Oriental etymology of the name *Γαλάται* (from גלח or גלל), see my Comment. in loc. and *Boettcher* as above, S. 74 sq. In the discourses of Jesus, which were delivered in Syro-Chaldaic, many verbal allusions may have disappeared in the process of translating into Greek, cf. *Glass.* l.c. p. 1339. But the attempt of modern critics to restore some of them, as in Matt. viii. 21 (*Eichhorn*, Einl. ins N. T. I. 504 f.) and Jno. xiii. 1 (*μεταβῇ*, פֶּסַח, פָּסַח), must be pronounced decidedly infelicitous.

Terent. Hecyr. prol. 1, 2 *orator* ad vos venio ornatu prologi, sinite 661
exorator sim.

That similar instances of paronomasia and annominatio would not be wanting in native Greek authors, particularly the orators, was naturally to be expected. Collections of them have been make by Tesmar, institut. rhetor. p. 156 ff.; Elsner, in diss. II. Paul. et Jesaias inter se comparati (Vratisl. 1821. 4to.) p. 24; Bremi, exc. 6 ad Isocr.; Weber, Demosth. p. 205. Cf. (further): Demosth. Aristocr. 457 b. *ἀνθρώπους οὐδὲ ἐλευθέρους ἀλλ' ὀλέθρους*, Plato, Phaed. 83 d. *ὁμότροπός τε καὶ ὁμότροφος*, Aesch. Ctesiph. § 78 *οὐ τὸν τρόπον ἀλλὰ τὸν τόπον μόνον μετήλλαξεν*, Strabo 9, 402 *φάσκειν ἐκείνους συνθέσθαι ἡμέρας, νύκτωρ δὲ ἐπιθέσθαι*, Antiph. 5, 91 *εἰ δέοι ἁμαρτεῖν ἐπί τῳ, ἀδίκως ἀπολῦσαι ὁσιώτερον ἂν εἴη τοῦ μὴ δικαίως ἀπολέσαι*, Diod. S. 11, 57 *δόξας παραδόξως διασεσῶσθαι*, Thuc. 2, 62 *μὴ φρονήματι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταφρονήματι* (Rom. xii. 3), Lys. in Philon. 17; Xen. A. 5, 8, 21; Plat. rep. p. 580 b.; Lach. p. 188 b.; Diod. Sic. Exc. Vat. p. 27, 5; Appian. civ. 5, 132 *τῶν νυκτοφυλάκων ἔθος καὶ εἶδος*, Diog. L. 5, 17; 6, 4; Aelian. anim. 14, 1; see Bttm. Soph. Philoct. p. 150; Lob. Soph. Aj. p. 138. In the Sept. and Fathers cf. especially Sus. 54, 55 *εἰπόν, ὑπὸ τί δένδρον εἶδες αὐτούς ... ὑπὸ σχῖνον. Εἶπε δὲ Δανιήλ ... σχίσει σε μέσον.* 58, 59 *εἶπεν· ὑπὸ πρῖνον. Εἶπε δὲ Δανιήλ ... τὴν ῥομφαίαν ἔχων πρίσαι σε μέσον* (cf. Africani ep. ad Orig. de hist. Susan. p. 220 ed. Wetsten.), 3 Esr. iv. 62 *ἄνεσιν καὶ ἄφεσιν*, Wisd. i. 10 *ὅτι οὖς ζηλώσεως ἀκροᾶται τὰ πάντα καὶ θροῦς γογγυσμῶν οὐκ ἀποκρύπτεται*, xiv. 5 *θέλεις μὴ ἀργὰ εἶναι τὰ τῆς σοφίας σου ἔργα* (cf. Grimm, Comment. on the Book of Wisdom, Introd. p. 40), Acta apocr. p. 243 *ἐξ ἀπειρίας μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπορίας*, Macar. hom. 2, 1 *τὸ σῶμα οὐχὶ ἓν μέρος ἢ μέλος πάσχει.* As to Latin, see Jani, ars poet. 423 sq.

3. Parallelismus membrorum, the well-known peculiarity of 594
Hebrew poetry, occurs also in the N. T. when the style rises to 7th ed.
the elevation of rhythm. This parallelism is sometimes *synonymous*, as in Matt. x. 26; Jno. i. 17; vi. 35; xiv. 27; Rom. ix. 2; xi. 12, 33; 1 Cor. xv. 54; 2 Thess. ii. 8; Heb. xi. 17; Jas. iv. 9; 2 Pet. ii. 3, etc., and sometimes *antithetic*, as in Rom. ii. 7; Jno. iii. 6, 20 f.; 1 Pet. iv. 6; 1 Jno. ii. 10, 17, etc. See, in particular, the hymn in Luke i. 46 ff.; cf. § 65, 5 p. 611 (E. G. Rhesa, de parallelismo sententiar. poet. in libris N. T. Regiom. 1811. II. 4; J. J. Snouk Hurgronje, de parallel. membror. in J. Chr. dictis observando. Utr. 1836. 8vo.). Sometimes dogmatical statements which might be expressed in a single proposition are divided in this way into 563
parallel members, Rom. iv. 25; x. 10. Likewise 1 Tim. iii. 16, 6th ed.
where parallelism is accompanied with entire similarity of the 662

clauses, appears to be a quotation from one of the hymns of the apostolic church.

4. The Greek verses or parts of verses[1] found in the N. T. are of two sorts: they either belong to Greek poets and are quoted as theirs; or they make their appearance suddenly and without any sign of quotation, — whether because they were current poetic utterances of unknown authorship, or, as is more frequently the case, were let fall by the writer unconsciously, which sometimes occurs even in good prose writers, but was pronounced a blemish by the ancient teachers of rhetoric.[2] The apostle Paul alone has inwoven poetic quotations into his discourses, and in three passages (J. Hoffmann de Paulo apost. scripturas profanas ter allegante. Tubing. 1770. 4to.):

a. In Tit. i. 12 there occurs an entire hexameter, from Epimenides of Crete (ἴδιος αὐτῶν προφήτης cf. vs. 5):

– ⏑ ⏑ | – – | – ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑ ⏑ | – –

Κρητες α|ει ψευ|σται, κακα | θηρια | γαστερες | αργαι.

b. Acts xvii. 28 contains the half of an hexameter:

– – | – ⏑ ⏑ | – ⏑

του γαρ | και γενος | εσμεν,

595 cf. Arat. Phaenom. 5, where the conclusion of the verse runs thus:
7th ed. ὁ δ' ἤπιος ἀνθρώποισι (δεξιὰ σημαίνει), so that a spondee occurs in the fifth foot, as frequently happens, particularly in Aratus 10, 12, 32, 33.

c. In 1 Cor. xv. 33 there is an Iamb. trimeter acatalectus (senarius):

– – | ⏑ – | – – | ⏑ – | ⏑ – | ⏑ –

φθειρου|σιν η|θη χρησθ' | ὁμι|λιαι | κακαι,

where, as often takes place, spondees are used in the odd feet 1 and 3 (Hm. doctr. metr. p. 74[3]). The quotation is from the well-known comic poet Menander, and, according to H. Stephanus, from his Thais (see Menandri Fragm. ed. Meineke p. 75, and Fragm.

[1] *Loeffler*, de versib. qui in soluta N. T. oratione habentur. L. 1718. 4to.; *Kosegarten*, de poetarum effatis graec. in N. T., also his Dissertatt. acad. ed. *Mohnike* p. 135 sqq.

[2] Cf. Cic. orat. 56, 189 (a passage erroneously quoted by *Weber*, Demosth. p. 208), Quintil. Instit. 9, 4, 52. 72 sqq.; *Fabric.* biblioth. latin. ed. *Ernesti* II. 389; *Nolten*, Antibarb. under the word versus; *Jacob*, Lucian. Alex. p. 52 sq.; *Dissen*, Demosth. cor. p. 315; *Franke*, Demosth. p. 6, likewise the Classical Journ. no. 45, p. 40 sqq. I have never seen the dissertation of *Loeffler* (*Moeller*) de versu inopinato in prosa. L. 1668. That condemnation of poetic insertions in prose, has been qualified and corrected by *Hm.* opusc. I. 121 sqq

[3] In *Hm.* doctr. metr. p. 139 *impari sede* is probably a misprint for *pari*.

comic. gr. ed. Meineke vol. 4 p. 132). However, the best Codd. 663
of the N. T. [Sin. also] give χρηστά without elision.

5. To the second of the above-mentioned classes[1] belong 564

a. The hexameter in Jas. i. 17, which even the old commentators 6th ed.
had recognized :

– ˘ ˘ | – ˘ ˘ | – – | – – | – ˘ ˘ | – ˘
πασα δο|σις αγα|θη και | παν δω|ρημα τε|λειον

(where, in the second foot in the arsis, σις might be used as long) ; see the commentators in loc. Schulthess tried to arrange the rest of the passage into two metrical verses ; but the rhythm is harsh, and the use of poetic words does not in James warrant us in inferring the presence of verses and restoring them by means of violent alterations and transpositions.

On the other hand b. an unmistakable hexameter occurs in Heb. xii. 13 in the words

– ˘ ˘ | – – | – – | – ˘ ˘ | – ˘ ˘ | – –
και τροχι|ας ορ|θας ποι|ησατε | τοις ποσιν | ὑμων :

And c. in Acts xxiii. 5 the words quoted from the Sept. may be scanned as an Iamb. trimet. acatal. :

– – | ˘ – | – – | – – | ˘ – | ˘ –
ἀρχον|τα του | λαου | σου ουκ | ερεις | κακως,

but, owing to the thrice occurring spondee in the 1st, 3d, and 4th 596
feet, it would be offensive to a Greek ear. 7th ed.

Lastly, in Jno. iv. 35 the words τετράμηνος ... ἔρχεται have the rhythm of a trimeter acatalect., if read thus :

˘ ˘ – | ˘ – | ˘ – | ˘ – | ˘ – | ˘ –
τετραμη|νος εσ|τι χώ| θερισ|μος ερχ|εται.

The first foot is an anapaest (Hm. doctr. metr. p. 119 sq.). As to χώ for καὶ ὁ, see Bttm. I. 122.

[1] Hunting for such verse is so much the more a matter of idle curiosity, as prosaic rhythm is different from poetic and sometimes does not permit these passages to appear as verse ; *Hm.* as above, p. 124 ; *Thiersch* in the Munich gel. Anzeigen 1849. Bd. 28 nr. 118. We have adduced such passages only as by themselves furnish a complete thought. For half or incomplete sentences containing a rhythm, see the Classical Journal, as above, p. 46 sq. Also in 2 Pet. ii. 22 some have, by combining the two proverbs, framed Iambic verses, see *Bengel.*

INDEX.

I. INDEX OF PRINCIPAL SUBJECTS.

The Figures refer to Pages.

Abbreviations popular 102.

Abnormal relation of words in a sentence 631 sqq.

Abounding verbs of, with the gen. 201.

Absolute cases 181; gen. 207 sq.; dat. 220; acc. 181, 231, 574.

Abstracts often without the art. 120; in the plur. 176; joined to concretes 530.

Accentuation 49 sqq.; distinguishes forms 53 sq.; of enclitic pron. 54.

Accusative the, with trans. verbs 221 sqq.; of kindred signification 224; of place after verbs of motion 224; of object, not expressed by ἐν (בְּ) 226; double 226 sqq.; after passives 229; as remote object 229 sqq.; specification of time and place 230; of closer specification 230; adverbial 464; absolute 181, 231, 574; with infin. 321; after ὅτι 573; of neut. pron. or adj. added to verb 227.

Accusing verbs of, with the gen. 203.

Active Verbs transitive 251 etc.; for reflexives 251; for passives 252; for middle 255 sq.

Adjectives inflection and comparison of 68 sqq.; derivative and compound 96 sqq.; with subst. and art. 131 sq.; used as subst. take the art. 108 sq.; neut. as subst. 95, 234, 517; with the voc. 183; subst. used for 236 sq.; alleged Hebr. use of fem. for neut. 238; comparison of 239 sqq.; used for adverbs 463; position of 523 sqq.; two or more without a copula 525; referring to substs. of different gend. or numb. 526 sq.; predicate 528; can they be omitted? 594 sq.; of result, proleptic use of 624; supposed abnormal relation of 634 sq.

Adverbs in ι or ει 43 sq.; used with art. for nouns 109; relative often include def. 159; prepositions combined with 422 sq.; prepositions used for 102, 423; N. T. writers masters of 462; use of adjs. and substs. for 463 sq.; are they used for adjs.? 465; adverbial notions expressed by the dat. or the part. 466; treated as verbal 467 sq.; used as prepositions 470 sq.; of place interchanged 471 sq.; irregular position of 553; no ellipsis of 595.

Aeolisms 36, 76, 83.

Alexandrian dialect 21; orthography 48; version (Sept.) 31 sq. 37 sq.

Amplification 523 sqq.; predicative 527.

Anacoluthon punctuation of 58; 168; in the Rev. 535 sq.; 566 sqq.; instances of peculiarly Greek 572 sqq.

Annominatio 637 sq.

Antiptosis 636.

Antithesis 441 sqq. 538, 540 sq.

Aorist used for pluperf. 275; for perf. ? 276; only in appearance for fut. 277; never in N. T expresses what *is wont* to be etc. 277; for pres. ? 278; de conatu ? 278 sqq.; aor. mid. for pass. ? 255; aor. pass. for mid. ? 261; Aeolic form of 1st aor. opt. 76; 2d aor. with ending α 73 sq.

Apodosis how introduced 541; doubled 541 sq.; omitted 599; in condensed structure 619.

Aposiopesis 599 sqq.

Apostrophe rare use of in N. T. 40 sq.

Apposition use of art. with words in 138; kinds of 528 sq.; construction of 529 sq.; so-called gen. of 531; to the voc. put in nom. 533; to a whole clause 533; position of 534; in breviloquence 624.

Aramaisms in N. T. 27 sq.

Arrangement of words etc. see Position.

Article the, as a pron. 104 sq.; before nouns 105 sqq.; generic 106; not used for a pronominal adj. 107; not used for rel. pron. 107; for possess. pron. 108; peculiarly Greek use of 108 sq.; with adjs. and parts. used as substs. 108; with πολλοί 110; with οὗτος or ἐκεῖνος 110; with πᾶς 110 sq.; with τοιοῦτος 111; with ἕκαστος 111; with αὐτός 112; with proper names 112; with the pred. 114; indefinitely ? 115; when optional 115 sq.; the indef. (τις) expressed sometimes by εἷς ? 117; its use or omission sometimes a characteristic of style 118; variation of MSS. as to use of 118; omission of with nouns denoting single objects etc. 119 sq.; with abstracts 120; with nouns rendered def. by a gen. 125; with a numeral 125 sq.; its use and omission with nouns connected by καί 126 sqq.; by ἤ 127; with attributives 131 sqq.; with attrib. part. 134; with a part. in a derisive force 135; when omitted with adjuncts 135 sqq.; use of with words in apposition 138; with an attributive joined to an anarthrous noun 139 sq.; with the infin. 320, 324.

Asyndeton 58, 520, 537 sqq.

Atticisms 36.

Attraction of the relative 163; by the relative 164; of the relative by a noun following 166; in structure 544, 625 sqq.

Augment temp. for syllab. 70; of verbs beginning with ευ 71; double 72; omitted 72 sq.

Beth essentiae 38, 184, 513.

Blended constructions as causing redundancies 605.

Breviloquence (brachylogy) 619 sqq.

Breathings over ρ 48.

Broken and heterogeneous structure 566 sqq.

Buying etc. verbs of, take gen. of price 206.

Cardinals repeated assume a distributive sense 249; use of the sing. to signify *one* 249; arrangement of in combinations 250.

Caring for verbs of, with the gen. 205.

Cases in general 179 sqq.; no enallage of 180; absolute 181, 220, 231. Cf. Absolute cases.

Cause dative of 216.

Chiasmus 411.

Cilicisms in N. T. 27.

Circumlocutions use of prepositions in 423 sqq.

Circumstantiality of style 605 sqq.

Clause necessary contents of a grammatical 56 sq., 512; want of connection of clauses 537 sq.; connection of by particles 539 sqq.; contrasted 540; connected by forms of inflection (infin. or part.) 543; position of 546 sqq., of a relative 167, 542; rhetorical transposition of 549; trajection of 551 sq., 560; one expressed twice 610; one resolved into two 629 sq. Cf. Structure of sentences.

Collectives with a plur. pred. and with a sing. 515 sq.; with plur. adj. 526.

Comma use of 56 sqq.; a half comma desirable 59.

Comparative of adverbs 69 sq.; of adj. sometimes formed by the pos. with μᾶλ-

λον a prep. or ἤ 240; strengthened by μᾶλλον 240; strengthened by a prep. 240; used for the pos. ? 242; for the superl. ? 242; in loose reference 245.

Comparison, of adjectives 69; abbreviated 245, 623.

Compound words formation of 99 sqq.; substantives 99 sq. 101; adjectives 100; verbs 100 sq. 102; adverbs 102; proper names 102 sq.

Conjunctions use of 433 sq.; conjunctive 434 sqq.; disjunctive 440 sq.; adversative 441 sq.; temporal, inferential, causal 444 sqq.; final and objective 449; not interchanged, nor weakened 449 sqq.; position of 119, 558 sq.; no ellipsis of 595.

Constructio ad sensum 141, 147, 513 sqq. 525 sqq. 631.

Constructio praegnans 621.

Construction see Structure of sentences.

Contraction 46, 102.

Copula agrees in number with subj. 513 sq.; omitted 521, 584 sq.

Correlation 440.

Crasis 46.

Dative the, of pers. pron. apparently pleonastic 155; after verbs 208 sq.; after εἶναι and γίνεσθαι 210; after substantives 211; of relation (*opinion, interest*, commodi and incommodi) 211 sq.; εἰς and ἐν in periphrasis for 212, 217; for the local πρός and εἰς 214; related to μετά 214; with verbs of coming 215; *in reference to which* (the sphere, the standard, the cause and motive) 215 sq.; instrumental 216; use of ἐν, κατά, διά etc. for 217; of time, whether a point or a period 218; of place 219; with passives 219; absolute 220; double 220 sq.; of the infin. 328; after ἐν 384 sqq.; after σύν 391; after ἐπί 392 sq.; after παρά 394; after πρός 395.

Dawes's rule 507.

Declension rare forms of the 1st 60; of the 2d 62; of the 3d 64; declension of foreign words 66; of adjectives 68.

Defective structure 580 sqq. Cf. Structure of sentences.

Defective Verbs 81 sqq.

Demonstrative pronouns neut. used adverbially 142; irregular reference of 157; included in the relative 158; repetition of 159 sq.; before ὅτι, ἵνα etc. 161; before a pred. infin. or a subst. 161; before a particip. constr. 161; the plur. for sing. 162; position of 162; omitted in cases of attraction 165 sq.; in loose reference 632.

Deponent Verbs 258 sq.

Derivation by terminations: of verbs 91, of substantives 93, of adjectives 96; by composition: of substantives 99, of adjectives 100, of verbs 100 sq.

Desiring verbs of, take the gen. 204.

Dialect the Alexandrian 20, 21; the Hellenistic 28; the Christian 35.

Digressions 565.

Diminutives 96.

Discord supposed, between subj. and pred. 517.

Disjoining verbs of, take prep. 197.

Distributives how expressed in N. T. 249.

Doric forms etc. 36.

Dual the, not found in N. T. 177.

Elision comparatively rare in N. T. 40.

Ellipsis with adj. 234; 580 sqq.; of the copula 584 sq.; of the subj. 588; list of substs. often omitted 590; of the noun with trans. verbs 593; none of adv. or conj. 595; partial of both subj. and pred. in the same clause 596; of a whole proposition 598; in quotations from O. T. 599.

Enallage of gend. in pronouns 141; of numb. in the same 141; of the gend. and numb. of nouns 174 sq.; of cases 180; of tenses 264; of prep. 361, 411; of numb. with verbs 515; of gend. with verbs 517.

Enclitics how to be written 54; position of 558.

Enjoying verbs of, with the gen. 197.

Epexegetical apposition 528; gen. 531.

Extension of subj. or pred. of a prop. 523 sqq.

Feeling verbs of, with the gen. 204.

Feminine the, is the neut. used for ? 179, 238; in contempt 179.

Foreign Words declens. of 66 sq.

Forms rare of the 1st or 2d declens. 60 sq.; of the 3d declens. 64 sq.; of regular verbs 73 sq.; of verbs in μι etc. 78 sq.

Fritzsche K. F. A. 10.

Fulness of expression 605, 609 sqq.

Future the, Attic 75; subjunctive 75; mid. for pass. 255; ethical (*may* or *should*) 279; 3d fut. pass. 279; not used for the pret. 280; sometimes nearly equiv. to the pres. 280; of a supposable case 280; supposed equiv. to the optat. 280; for the impera. 315.

Gataker Thom. 14.

Gender of Nouns new 36, 63, 65; 174 sqq.; the neut. used of a person 178; supposed interchange of 178 sq.; supposed contemptuous force of fem. 179; a noun of any gend. taken merely as a word is treated as neut. 179.

Genitive the, of pron. position of 155; import and use of 184 sqq.; objective 185; and subjective 186; of remote dependence 187 sqq.; of local and temporal reference (see below) 187 sq.; of relationship 190, 593; several gov. one by another 190; separated from governing noun 155, 191; two of different signif. (pers. and thing) 191; placed *before* its noun 192, 551; supposed use of περί, ἀπό, ἐκ, παρά, ἐν, κατά, εἰς in circumlocution for 192 sq.; with adjs. and parts. 194; after εἶναι or γίνεσθαι 195; of separation and removal 196; with verbs of the senses, and of beginning, receiving, begging, giving etc. 197 sq.; partitive 200 sqq.; gov. by an adverb 203; partit. gen. as subject 203; with verbs of accusing, boasting, smelling 203 sq.; with verbs of feeling, longing, remembering, caring for, ruling 204 sqq.; of price 206; of place and of time 207; absol. 207, 544; of material 237; with the compar. 239 sq.; of apposition 531.

Georgi Ch. Sgm. 15.

Giving verbs of, with the gen. 197.

Grammar N. T., scope and treatment of 1 sq.; history of 5 sqq.; works upon 10 sq.; grammat. peculiarities of later Gr. 26 sq.; of the language of the N. T. 36 sq.

Greek later, peculiarities of 20 sqq.

Haab Ph. H. 6.

Hebraisms opinions on 13 sqq.; errors of writers concerning 29 sq.; definition of 30; perfect and imperfect 31; specified 32 sqq. 38 sq.; in connection with certain pronouns (πᾶς) 171 sq.; εἰς and ἐν in supposed circumlocution for the nom. 183; supposed Hebr. use of a fem. adj. for neut. 238; supposed use of υἱός etc. for adjs. (employed as subs.) 238; Hebr. superl. 246; supposed Hebr. interchange of tenses 264; in use of imperatives 311.

Hellenistic Dialect the term 28; its peculiarities cf. 22 sqq.

Hendiadys 630.

Heterogeneous Structure 577 sq.

Hiatus 40 sq.

Hypallage 634.

Hyperbaton 555 sq.

Hypodiastole the 46.

Hypothetical Sentences, four kinds of etc. 291 sqq.

Hysteron Proteron 553.

Imperative the, 3d pers. plur. of 76; usual import of 310; permissive 311; two connected by καί 311; aor. and pres. distinguished in N. T. 313 sq.; perfect 315; substitutes for 315 sq.

Imperfect the use of 268 sqq.; apparently for the aor. 269; never for the pluperf. 269; conjoined with the aor. 270; apparently for the pres. 270.

Impersonal Verbs 522, 588.

Indeclinable Words accent of 52; 61, 67.

Indefinite (article) pron. (τις) sometimes expressed by εἷς 117; use of 170; position of 170 sq.

Indicative the, distinguished from the subjunc. and the opt. 281; imperf. sometimes used for our subjunc. 282; pres. in direct questions to be distinguished from the subjunc. 284; after particles of design 289; with ἐάν 295; with particles of time 296; with interrogatives in indirect quest. 298; after εἰ, εἰ ἄρα, εἴπως 300; in the orat. obliq. 301; with ὄφελον 301 sq.; with ἄν 302 sqq.

Infinitive the, for the imperat. 316; epexegetic 318, 326; as the subject 319; as the object 321 sq.; in the oblique cases, especially to express design 324 sq.; with the art. 320, 323, 324; after ἐγένετο 323; with ἐστί 320 sq.; with the acc. 321, 323; with τοῦ 324 sqq.; with τῷ 328; with preps. 328 sq.; after πρίν 330; pres. and aor. distinguished in N. T. 330 sq.; perf. 331, 334; with μέλλειν 37, 333; ἵνα sometimes used for 320, 334 sqq.; sometimes gives place to a clause with εἰ, ἐάν etc. 320; in modern Gr. 336; act. apparently for pass. 339; after ὅτι 339, 573; in imitation of Hebr. infin. absol. 339; as a means of connection 543.

Interjections 356.

Interrogative, neut. of τίς used adverbially 142; particles, how construed 298,508 sqq.; clauses 543, two interrog. predicates blended 628.

Interrupted Structure 561 sqq.

Ionic forms 36, 62, 84 sq.

Iota subscript 46 sq.

Jews the, how learned Greek 20 sqq.; Jewish Greek 27 sqq.

Language two aspects of 1; of N. T. history of opinions concerning 12 sqq.; basis of 20 sqq.; Hebrew-Aramaic tinge of 27 sq.; grammatical character of 35 sqq.

Latin its influence on Byzantine Greek 28; Lat. terminations of patronymics 95; words in N. T. Greek 103.

Letters interchange of in Alex. orthog. 48.

Lexicography 1.

Lexicology 1.

Masculine supposed to be used for the fem. 178.

Metaplasms 63.

Middle Voice its force 252 sqq.; of mental objects 253; in a new signification 253, 254; with acc. often has the pron. expressed 254; expressive of the subject's order or permission 254; in reciprocal sense 254; tenses sometimes in pass. sense 254 sq.; active sometimes used for 255; act. and mid. sometimes interchangeable 256; with ἑαυτῷ 257; apparently for active 258; mid. verbs to be distinguished from deponent 258 sq.; too many verbs regarded as in 252.

Moods lax use of with particles 36; use of in independent propositions 282 sq.; in dependent propositions 287 sqq.; with particles of design 287; in hypothetical sentences 291; with particles of time 296; with interrogatives 298; in oratio obliqua 300; with ὥστε 301; with ἄν 302 sqq.; after conditional clauses 303; in relative clauses 306; in indirect questions 308; after particles of time 308. Cf. Imperative, Indicative, Infinitive, etc.

Names of persons, from oxytones throw back the accent 51; indeclinable accented on last 52; contracted 102 sq.; with the art. 112 sq.

Negation (473 sqq.) continued 487; unconditional, in antithesis or followed by ἀλλά 496; in oaths expressed by εἰ 500; in interrogative sentences 510.

Negative Particles 473 sqq.; objective and subjective 473; use of μή 476 sq.; in relative clauses with ἄν 480; with the infin. 481; with participles 482; in succession 487 sqq.; after an affirmative sentence or followed by ἀλλά 495; two in a single clause 498; with the moods 500 sqq.; in dependent clauses 502; the intensive οὐ μή 505 sq., in interrog. sentences 510.

Neuter used of persons 178; for the fem. 178; verbs connected with their pred. nouns by preps. 232 sq.; plur., when joined to a sing. and when to a plur. verb 514; adj. used as subst. 517;

neut. adj. or part. referring to a whole clause 533.

N. T. Grammar, Language, etc. see Grammar, Language etc.

Nominative the, absolute 181, 574; titular 181 sq.; for the voc. 182; in exclamations 183, 532; supposed circumlocution for by means of εἰς 183; by means of ἐν 184.

Nouns, proper with altered accent 50 sq.; derived from verbs 93 sq.; in μος 93; in μα and σις 93; in μονη 93; derived from adjectives 94 sq.; in τηϛ 94; in οτηϛ 94; in συνη 95; in ια 95; in ηριον 96; in ἁϛ 102 sq.; proper with the art. 112; list of anarthrous 120 sqq.; used instead of the pron. 144; antecedent incorporated into the relative clause 164; Hebr. repetition of for *every* 174, 463; several plur. in Greek though sing. in English 176; of kindred signification, with verbs 224; substituted for adjs. 236; list of often omitted 590 sqq. Cf. Abstracts, Collectives, Gender, Number, etc.

Number: use of plur. pronouns referring to a sing. noun 141; of nouns, collective use of the sing. 174; plur. of category 175; plur. used in Greek, though we use the sing. 176; dual does not occur in N. T. 177; use of plur. to signify two 177; neut. sing. or plur. used of persons 178; use of sing. to signify one 249; of the pred. differing from that of the subj. 513 sqq.; plur. used of himself by speaker 517.

Numerals 248 sqq.; use of card. for ord. in expressing first day of week 248; ordinal, abbreviated use of 249; cardinal in distributive sense 249; arrangement of in combinations 250; construction of with ἐπάνω 250.

Object gen. of 186; a single belonging to two verbs 521.

Optative the, distinguished from the indic. and subjunc. 281; use of in independ. prop. 286; in depend. prop. 288; after ἵνα 290 sq.; after εἰ 293; after a particle of time 297; after an interrogative 299; in the oratio obliqua 300 sq.; with ἄν 303; in indirect quest. 308, 310.

Oratio Variata 577 sqq.; mingling of orat. rect. and obliq. 301, 545, 579.

Ordinals a peculiar abbreviated use of 249. Cf. Numerals.

Orthography variations of in MSS. 40; Alexandrian 43, 48.

Parallelism antithetic 610, 639; not pleonastic 611; synonymous 639.

Parataxis 630.

Parathetic apposition 528.

Parentheses in N. T. 562 sq.; in the historical books 563 sq.; in the epistles 565.

Paronomasia 636 sq.

Partaking verbs of, with the gen. 200.

Partitive gen. 200 sqq., as subject 203, 513; partitive apposition 528.

Participle the, as a subst. takes the art. 108, 353; as an attributive, takes or omits the art. 134; its verbal character 340; use of pres. 341 sqq. 353; fut. 340; aor. 342 sq.; perf. pass. 343; construction of 343; to be resolved by a particle of time 344; with καίτοι or καίπερ 344; two or more in different relations without a copula 344; apparently for an infin. yet different 345 sq.; periphrastic construction with εἶναι 348 sq.; is it ever used for the finite verb 350 sqq.; with the gen. 354; in imitation of the Hebr. infin. absol. 354; absolutely, referring to a clause 533 sq.; with the art. as pred. 513; as a means of connection between clauses 543; in abnormal case, particularly the nom. 572.

Particles the, lax use of in N.T. 36; how certain should be written 45; of design, how construed 287; of time 296, 308; in general 356 sqq.; how classified 356; comparatively frugal use of in N. T. 357; works on 358; position of 558; no ellipsis of 595. Cf. Interrogative, Negative etc.

Pasor G. 5.

Passive the, with the dat. 219; with the acc. 229, 260; 1st aor. used for the

classic 1st aor. mid. 261; perf. and pluperf. in mid. sense 262; perf. supposed to be used for perf. act. 262; fut., singular use of 262 sq.; is it ever used like the Hebr. Hophal? 263; forms, how to be distinguished from the same in the middle voice 263.

Paul his knowledge of Greek 21; his doctrinal system as a guide to his language 98, 130; his use of the art. with Χριστός 118; his multiplication of relatives 167; his use of the gen. of more remote internal relations 188; his separation of the gen. from its noun 191; his use of the infin. with εἰς or πρός 329; fond of participial constructions 355; his doctrinal use of prepositions 360; his accumulation of prepositions 418; his bold arrangement of words 547; his use of parentheses 565 sq.; and anacolutha 567 sq.; fond of paronomasia 636.

Perception verbs of, with the gen. 199.

Perfect the, pass. for mid. 262; pass. said to be used for act. 262; its import and use 270 sq.; in connection with the aor. 272; for the aor. in narration 272; how far used for the pres. 272 sq.; prophetic 273; supposed use of for pluperf. 274; in sense of pres. 274.

Periodic Structure in the N. T. 545.

Personal Pronouns multiplied in N. T. 143; occasionally omitted 143; occasional use of nouns for 144; loose reference of 145 sq.; repetition of 147 sq.; in nom. always emphatic 152; position of 155; dat. apparently superfluous 155; ἡ ψυχή μου etc. in circumlocution for ? 156.

Persons rare forms of, in regular verbs 75 sqq.

Pfochen Seb. 13.

Place gen. of 207; dat. of 219; acc. of after verbs of motion 224; as a specification 230.

Pleonasm 601 sqq.; causes of 602; for the most part circumstantiality or fulness 605 sq.; supposed instances of examined 612 sqq.

Pluperfect augment of omitted 72; pass. in mid. sense 262; of certain verbs. equiv. to imperf. 274; when expressed by the aor. 275.

Plural the, of category 175; of certain nouns used for the sing. 176; of names of countries and cities 176; of nouns denoting a feeling etc. 176; Hebr. *plur. maj.* or *excellentiae* 177; for the dual 177; neut. used of a person 178; used of himself by the speaker 517.

Polysyndeton 519, 540.

Position of words and clauses 546 sqq.; how determined 546; works on 546 sq.; in N. T. simple 547; in the apostolic benediction 549; of the vocative 549; causes of unusual 549; of the predicate 551; of the gen. before its noun 155, 192, 551; trajection 551 sq.; hysteron proteron 553; irregular, of single words, particularly certain adverbs and negatives 553 sq.; of πρό, ἀπό etc. in specifications of place and time 557 sq.; of particles and enclitic pronouns 558; supposed transposition of clauses 560; as affected by a regard to sound 636 sq. Cf. Adjectives, Apposition etc.

Positive the, with μᾶλλον a prep. or ἤ instead of the compar. 240; for the superl. 246.

Possessive Pronouns 143 sqq.; sometimes to be taken objectively 153; ἴδιος used for 153 sq.; circumlocutions for 154 sq.

Predicate the art. with 114; its connection with the subj. 512 sqq.; a clause as 513; consisting of a part. with the art. 513; grammat. discord between pred. (or copula) and subj. 513 sqq.; grammat. form of compound 518; several, how connected 519; several with a common object 521; indispensable 521; extended by adjuncts 523 sqq.; 527; when placed first 551.

Prepositions predilection for in N. T. 32, 38, 180; compound 102; connecting a (neut.) verb with its dependent noun 232 sq.; for adverbs 250, 423; general remarks on 358 sqq.; the proper sense of to be distinguished from the metaphorical 360; interchange of 361 sq. 411 sq.; interchange

of cases with 363; position of 363; with the gen. 364 sqq.; with the dat. 384 sqq.; with the acc. 396 sqq.; the same in the same sentence used to denote different relations 409; different in the same sentence 410 sq.; kindred substituted for each other in parallel passages 411 sq.; ἐν and εἰς not used indiscriminately 413 sqq.; accumulation of by Paul 418; repetition of 419 sq.; omitted before the relative 421 sq.; combined with adverbs 422; in circumlocutions 154, 192, 423; after compound verbs 425 sqq.; two blended into one 629.

Present the, its force 265; only in appearance for the fut. 265; for the aor. in narration 266 sq.; conjoined with the aor. 267; may include also a past tense 267; in dependent clauses apparently for the imperf. 268; perfs. and aors. equiv. to 274; with force of perf. 274. Cf. Aorist, Future, Perfect.

Prophetic Perfect the Hebr. 273.

Pronouns enclitic 54; indef. expressed sometimes by εἷς 117; use of in N. T. 140 sqq.; differing in gend. or numb. from their noun 141; in supposed reference to a following noun 142; neuter used adverbially 142; personal and possessive 143 sqq.; repetition of 147 sq.; demonstrative 157 sqq.; relative 163 sqq.; interrogative and indefinite 168 sqq.; Hebraisms in connection with 171 sqq.; in loose reference 632 sq. Cf. Demonstrative, Personal etc.

Proper Names throw back the accent 51; contracted forms of 102; with the art. 112 sqq.

Proposition see Clause and Structure.

Protasis 291. Cf. Apodosis.

Prozeugma of the demonstr. pron. 162.

Punctuation of the N. T. 55 sqq.

Purists the, history of 12 sqq.; a criticism of their efforts 16.

Questions rel. pron. put for interrog. in direct 167; the subjunc. in undetermined 285; indirect 298 sq. 308, 543; negative 510 sq.; with the fut. for the imperat. 315; brachylogy in 628. Cf. Interrogative.

Quotation peculiar biblical formula of 522.

Redundant Structure 601 sqq.

Reduplication 72 sq.; of verbs in ρ 74 sq.

Reflexive Pronoun used in reference to the 1st and 2d pers. 150 sq.; with the middle voice 257.

Relative Pronouns thought to refer sometimes to the more remote noun 157; include the demonstrative 158; attraction with 163 sq.; agree sometimes with following noun 166; for interrogative 167; multiplied by Paul 167; before whole clauses 168; not used for demonstrative 168.

Relative Clauses position of 167; use of 542 sq.

Revelation book of, its irregularities of style 534.

Rhetoric (stylistics) of N. T. 1 sq.

Ruling verbs of, with the gen. 206.

Schema κατ' ἐξοχήν 520.

Sentence see Clause, and Structure.

Septuagint its Greek style 31 sq. 37 sqq.

Singular (the distributive) for the plural 174.

Smelling verbs of, with the gen. 203.

Structure of Sentences: of a simple 512 sqq.; of compound 518 sq.; by extension of subj. or pred. 523 sqq.; their connection 537 sqq.; asyndeton 537; polysyndeton 519, 540; position of words and clauses in 546 sqq.; interrupted (parenthetic) structure 561 sqq.; broken and heterogeneous (anacoluthon 566, oratio variata 577) 566 sqq.; defective (ellipsis 580, aposiopesis 599) 580 sqq.; redundant (pleonasm 601, blended 605, circumstantiality 605, fulness 609) 601 sqq.; condensed and expanded (breviloquence 619, constructio praegnans 621, attraction 625, hendiadys 630) 619 sqq.; irregularities of relating to single words (hypallage) 631 sqq.; regard to sound in (parono-

masia 636, annominatio 638, parallelism 639, verse 640) 636 sqq. Cf. Clauses, Asyndeton, Attraction, Position, etc.

Style (stylistics) in N. T. 1 sq. 31, 33, 35, 37 sq.; of individual writers 4, 29, 33, 39, 118, 546 sq. Cf. Paul etc.

Subject the, in relation to the art. 115; gen. of 186; relation to the sentence 512 sqq.; a partitive gen. may be used for 203, 513; relation of copula and predicate to 513 sqq.; compound 518; one rendered prominent 519, 520; may be implied 521 sq.; extension of 523 sqq.; wanting 588, 631; sudden change of 631 sq.

Subjunctive the future 75, 86; distinguished from the indic. and the optat. 281; in independent propositions 285 sq.; in dependent propositions 287 sqq.; in hypothetical sentences 291 sq.; after particles of time compounded with ἄν 297, 308; after interrogatives 298; after ὥστε 301; in relative clauses with ἄν 307; with ἵνα for the imperat. 315; with ἵνα for the infin. 334 sqq.

Substantives see Nouns.

Superlative the, circumlocution for 246; Hebr. modes of expressing 246 sq.; strengthened by πάντων 248.

Synizesis 622.

Synonymes 611.

Syntax peculiarities of, few in later and N. T. Greek 27; 36 sqq.

Technical Terms religious in N. T. 35.

Tenses rare forms in 73 sqq.; how far interchanged 264; import and use of the pres. 265 sq.; imperfect 268 sq.; perfect 270 sq.; aorist 275 sq.; force of in the moods 281; future 279 sq.; different connected 280 sq. Cf. Aorist etc.

Thinking of verbs expressing take the gen. 205.

Time gen. of 207; dat. of 218; acc. of 229 sq.; particles of, how construed 296 sq., with ἄν 308.

Touching laying hold of, verbs of take the gen. 201.

Trajection (transposition) of words 513 sqq.; of clauses 560.

Transition from a participial constr. to a finite verb 573; from ὅτι to the (acc. with) infin. 573; from a relative constr. to a personal 579; from oratio obliq. to rect. and vice versa 579; from the sing. to the plur. and the reverse 580. Cf. Structure of sentences.

Verbs augm. and redupl. of 70 sqq.; rare forms in tenses and persons of regular 73 sqq.; in verbs in μι and irregular verbs 78 sqq.; list of defective 82 sqq.; later forms of not always used in N. T. 90; same forms may come from different 91; derivative 91; compound 100; decomposite 102; intransitives with acc. of thing 227; neut. used transitively 251, 263; compounded with prepositions, how construed 425 sqq.; with ἀπό 427; with ἀνά 428; with ἀντί 429; with ἐκ 429; with ἐν 429; with εἰς 430; with ἐπί 430; with διά 431; with κατά 431; with μετά 432; with παρά 432; with περί 432; with πρό 432; with πρός 432; with σύν 433; with ὑπό 433; with ὑπέρ 433; in circumlocutions for adverbs 467 sq. Cf. Active etc.; Tenses etc.

Verbal substantives 93 sqq. (cf. nouns); adjectives 96 sq.

Verses found in N. T. 640 sq.

Vocative use of nom. for 182; most frequently without ὦ 183; position of 549.

Voices see Active, Middle, Passive.

Vorst J. 14.

Words see Derivation, Position, Paronomasia etc.

Wyss Caspar 5.

Zeugma 622.

II. INDEX OF GREEK WORDS AND FORMS.

The Figures refer to Pages.

α privative, intensive, formative 100.
-α, -ᾶ in the gen. 60.
α in forms of 2d aor. 73.
ἅ for δι' ἅ 142.
Ἀαρών 67.
Ἀβιά accent 52.
ἀγαθυεργεῖν 26.
ἀγαθοποιεῖν 25.
ἀγαθὸς πρός τι and εἴς τι 363.
ἀγαθουργεῖν 25, 101.
ἀγαθωσύνη 25.
ἀγαλλιᾶν 24.
ἀγαλλίασις 25.
ἀγανακτεῖν constr. of 232.
ἀγάπη without art. 120; θεοῦ or Χριστοῦ 185.
Ἄγαρ, τό 179.
ἀγγέλλω forms of 82.
ἄγγελος art. with 124; ἄγγελοι and οἱ ἄγγ. 124.
ἀγενεαλόγητος 25, 26.
τὰ ἅγια 176, 177; ἡ ἅγια ἁγίων 246; οἱ ἅγιοι 35, 234; ἅγιον, τό 592.
ἁγιασμός 93.
ἁγιότης 25.
ἁγνίζεσθαι 252.
ἀγνοεῖν ἐν 629.
ἁγνότης 25.
ἄγνυμι forms of 82.
ἀγορά without art. 121.
ἀγόραιοι accent 53; sc. ἡμέραι 590.
ἀγριέλαιος 25.
ἀγρός without art. 121.
ἄγω forms of 82; ἄγε with plur. subject 516; ἄγ. τινί 215; ἄγωμεν 251.
ἀγωνίζομαι 260.
ἀδελφός supposed ellipsis of 593.
ἀδικεῖσθαι 254.
ἀδροτής 52 sq.
ἀεί position of 553.
ἀετός 22.
ἄζυμα 176.
-αζω verbs in 92.
ἀθῶος ἀπό τ. 180, 197.
Αἴγυπτος never has art. 112.
αἷμα 30; αἷμα ἐκχέειν 33; αἵματα 177.
αἱματεκχυσία 25, 26, 99.
αἰνεῖν with dat. 536.
-αινω aor. of verbs in 75; verbs in 92.
αἴρειν sc. τὰς ἀγκύρας 594.
αἱρετίζω 26.
αἱρέω forms of 82; αἱροῦμαι 253.
αἰσχύνομαι with part. and with infin. 346.
αἰτεῖν constr. of 227.
αἴτημα 24.
αἰχμαλωτεύειν 25.
αἰχμαλωτίζειν 25.
αἰῶνες 176; οἱ αἰῶν. τῶν αἰών. 247.
αἰώνιος inflec. 69.
ἀκαίρως 463.
ἀκατάριτος 236.
ἀκμήν 464.
ἀκολουθεῖν ὀπίσω 214, 234.
ἀκουτίζω 26.
ἀκούω forms of 82; constr. of 199 sq. 347; signific. of 274.
ἀκρόβυστος, ἀκροβυστία 24, 99.
ἀκρογωνιαῖος 236.
ἀλάλητος 23, 97.
ἀλείφειν constr. of 227.
ἀλεκτοροφωνία 25.
ἀλέκτωρ 23.
Ἀλεξᾶς 25.
ἀλήθειν 22.
ἀλλά distinguished from δέ 441 sq.; in abrupt transitions 442; οὐκ ... ἀλλά 442; ἀλλ' ἤ 442; not used for οὖν 451; nor for εἰ μή 451; nor for *sane* 451; after a single neg. 495; before apod. 541; ἀλλά γε 559; ἀλλ' ἵνα 620.
ἀλλάσσειν constr. of 206.

ἄλλομαι forms of 82.
ἄλλος in apposition 529; position of 548; omitted 595.
ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος 25, 99.
ἅμα 470.
ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμαρτέω forms of 82; constr. of 233.
ἁμαρτία without art. 120.
ἀμφί does not occur in N. T. 372.
-αν for ασι in perf. 76; ᾶν in infin. omits ι subscr. 47.
ἄν force and use of 302 sqq.; omission of 282, 305 sq. 307, 333, 595, for ἐάν 291; in relative clauses 306; in indirect question 308.
ἀνά with the acc. 398; constr. of verbs compounded with 428.
ἀνάβα 79.
ἀνάγκη 30.
ἀνάθεμα 24, 32.
ἀναθεματίζειν 33.
ἀνακαινόω 26.
ἀνακάμπτειν 251.
ἀνακεῖσθαι 23.
ἀνακλίνειν 23.
ἀνανεοῦσθαι 263.
ἀναξίως 463.
ἀνάπεσαι 74.
ἀναπίπτειν 23.
ἀναστρέφειν 251, 469.
ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν 188.
ἀνάστεμα 24.
ἀνατέλλειν 251.
ἀνατίθημι 253.
ἀνατολαί 176.
ἀνέλεος 100.
ἀνεπαίσχυντος 236.
ἄνευ 471.
ἀνέχομαι augm. of 72; forms of 83.
ἀνήρ (φονεύς etc.) 30; without art. 122; ἄνδρες in addresses 610.
ἁμαρτάνειν ἁμαρτίαν 225.
ἀνθρωπάρεσκος 25.
ἀνίστημι σπέρμα τινί 33; ἀνάστα 79; ἀναστάς redundant? 608.
ἀνοίγω augm. of 72; forms of 83; ἀν. τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς etc. 33; γλῶσσαν 622.
ἀνόμως 463.
-ανος ending of patronym. nouns 95.
ἀνταπόδομα 25.
ἀνταποκρίνεσθαι 25.
ἀντί of price 206; with the gen. 364; constr. of verbs compounded with 429.
ἄντικρυς 42.
ἀντίλυτρον 25.
Ἀντίπας 103.
ἄντλημα 93.
ἀνώγαιον or ἀνάγαιον 43.
ἀνώτερος 69.
ἀναμιμνήσκειν constr. of 205, 226 sq.
ἀντιλέγειν 23.
ἄξιος, ἀξιοῦν constr. of 206.
ἀπάγγομαι 253.
ἀπαίδευτος 96.
ἅπαντάω forms of 83.
ἀπάντησις 24.
ἀπαράβατος 25.
ἀπαρτισμός 24.
ἀπείραστος 97.
ἀπελπίζειν 24.
ἀπερισπάστως 463.
ἀπέχω 275; ἀπέχεσθαι constr. of 427.
ἀπό in alleged circumloc. for the gen. 193; with verbs of eating, taking etc. 199; with verbs of fulness 201; meaning of etc. 364 sq. 369 sq.; distinguished from ἐκ 364; distinguished from ὑπό 369; distinguished from παρά with passives 370; with verbs of *receiving* etc. 370; constr. of verbs compounded with 427 sq.; trajection of with the gen. of place? 557; ἀπὸ ἄνωθεν 603; ἀπ' ἄρτι 422; ἀπὸ πέρυσι 422; ἀπὸ πρωΐ 422; ἀπὸ τότε 422; ἀπὸ μακρόθεν 603; ἀπὸ μέρους 423; ἀπὸ μιᾶς 423, 591; ἀπὸ μικροῦ ἕως μεγάλου 18.
ἀποβλέπειν εἰς 622.
ἀπογράφεσθαι 254.
ἀποδίδομαι 253.
ἀποθνήσκειν constr. of 210, 226, 227, 428.
ἀποκαθίστημι augm. of 72.
ἀποκεφαλίζειν 25.
ἀποκρίνομαι 23, 253, 261.
ἀποκτείνω forms of 83; signif. of 253.
ἀποκυεῖ and ἀποκύει 88.
ἀπολέσω 83.
ἀπολαμβάνειν constr. of 428.
ἀπόλλυμι forms of 83.
Ἀπολλώς 62, 102.
ἀπολύομαι 253.
ἀποπίπτειν constr. of 427.
ἀποῤῥίπτειν 251.
ἀποστασία 24.
ἀποστέλλειν 594.
ἀποστερεῖσθαι with gen. 196; signif. of 254.
ἀποτάσσεσθαι 23.

ἀποτόμως 463.
ἄπταιστος 97.
ἀπώσατο 90.
ἄρα meaning and use of 444 sq.; before apod. 541, 542; position of 558; ἄρα οὖν 445, 558.
ᾶρα interrog. 510.
ἀργός, -η, -ον, 24, 68.
ἀργύρια 176.
ἀρέσκειν constr. of 233.
ἀρεσκεία accent 51.
τὰ ἀριστερά 176.
ἀρκεῖσθαι constr. of 232.
ἀρνεῖσθαι 259.
ἀροτριᾶν 24.
ἁρπάζω forms of 83.
ἄρσεναν 66.
ἄρσην 22.
Ἀρτεμᾶς 102.
ἀρτέμων inflec. 64.
ἄρτον φαγεῖν 33.
ἀρχή without art. 124; τὴν ἀρχήν *altogether* 464.
-αρχης 61.
-αρχος 61 sq.
ἄρχομαι constr. of 346; alleged pleonasm of 612 sq.; peculiar use of 633.
Ἀσία art. with 112.
ἀσπάζομαι 259, 260.
ἀστέραν 66.
ἀστοχεῖν with gen. 196.
ἀσφαλῆν 66, 69.
ἀσφαλίζεσθαι τοὺς πόδας εἰς etc. 622.
ἀτενίζειν 24, 100.
ἀτιμάζεσθαι 252, 263.
αὐθεντεῖν 23.
αὐξάνω forms of 83, 251.
αὖρα ellipsis of 591.
αὐτοκατάκριτος 236.
αὐτός in loose reference 145 sq. 632; subjoined to the subject 147 sq. 519; subjoined to the relative 148; repeated 149; καὶ αὐτός for ὅς 149; unemphatic? 150; ὁ αὐτός 112; with dat. 150; αὐτός ἐγώ 153; αὐτοῦ or αὐτοῦ? 151 sq.; αὐτοῦ before the governing subst. 155; in apposition 530; αὐτὸ τοῦτο adv. 142.
ἀφεδρών 95.
ἀφίδω 45.
ἀφίημι, ἀφίω, ἀφέω 81.
ἀφιστάναι constr. of 427.
ἀφορᾶν εἰς 622.
ἀφυπνόω 26.
Ἀχαΐα art. with 112.
ἀχειροποίητος 236.
ἄχρι or ἄχρις? 42; constr. of 297, 471.

Βάαλ, ἡ 179.
βαθμός 22.
βαίνω forms of 79.
βαλάντιον form of 43.
βάλλειν 251 sq.
βαπτίζω constr. of 216, 217, 412; mid. 254 255, 621; βαπτ. τινὰ εἴς τι 622.
βάπτισμα 25, 35, 93.
βαπτισμός 621.
βαρέω 24; forms of 83.
βασιλεύειν constr. of 180, 206.
βασίλισσα 24, 95.
βασκαίνω forms of 83; constr. of 223.
βάτος, ἡ 36; ὁ 63.
βεβαία 69.
βεμβράνας 22.
Βηθαβαρᾶ decl. 61.
Βηθσαϊδά indecl. 61.
Βηθφαγῆ 52; indecl. 61.
βιβλαρίδιον 24, 96.
βιόω forms of 84; χρόνον 226.
βλάπτειν constr. of 227.
βλαστάνω forms of 84; 251.
βλασφημεῖν constr. of 222, 629.
βλέπειν ἀπό 39; τι 223; εἰς 233.
βοᾶν constr. of 212.
βόσκεσθαι 252.
βουλεύεσθαι 254.
βούλομαι aug. of 70; ἐβουλόμην without ἄν 283.
βουνός 22.
βραδυτής 52 sq.
βρέχειν 23.

Γαλιλαία art. with 112.
γαμέω forms of 84; mid. 254.
γαμίσκω 92.
γάμοι 176.
γάρ origin and signification of 445 sq.; in explanations 446, and going before 447; in rejoinders 446; in questions 447; repeated 447 sq.; not to be taken for *but* 453; nor for *therefore* 454; nor for *although* 454; nor for *on the contrary* 454; nor for *nevertheless* 454; nor as a mere copula 454; sometimes equiv. to δέ 452, 456; position of 558; introducing parenth. 562.

Γεθσημανῆ or -νεῖ 52.
γελάω forms of 84.
γένει and τῷ γένει 120.
γενέσια 24, 176.
γεννήματα 23, 25.
γεύεσθαι constr. of 36, 198; θανάτου 33.
γῆ without art. 120; ellipsis of 592.
γηράσκω 92.
γήρει dat. 64.
γίγνομαι forms of 84; construed with εἰς 183 sq.; with gen. 195 sq.; with dat. 210 sq.; ἐγένετο with acc. and inf. 323; never used periphrastically 350; with pred. adj. 515; ellipsis of 586; καὶ ἐγένετο pleonastically 608.
γινώσκειν signific. 263; ἄνδρα 18.
γλῶσσα 32; ellipsis of 591; γλωσσαῖς λαλεῖν 594.
γλωσσόκομον 24, 94.
γνήσιος inflec. 69.
γογγύζω 22.
γονυπετεῖν τινα 210.
Γολγοθᾶ indecl. 61.
τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα 177.
αἱ γραφαί 177.
γράφω in the preterite 278.
γρηγορῶ 26, 92.
γυμνητεύειν 25.
γυναικάριον 96.
γυνή ellipsis of 190.

δαίμων, δαιμόνια 23, 239.
Δανεῖδ spelling of 44.
δέ meaning and use of 441, 443; distinguished from ἀλλά 441 sq.; μέν . . . δέ 441, 443; οὐ (μή) . . . δέ 442; οὔπω . . . δέ 442; καὶ . . . δὲ 443; δὲ . . . καί 443; never means *therefore* 452; nor *for* 452; nor is it a *mere* particle of transition 453; as related to γάρ 456; after a single neg. 495, 539 sq.; position of 558; introducing parenth. 562.
δειγματίζειν 25, 26.
δεῖπνος, ὁ 65.
δεκατοῦν 24.
δεξιά without art. 122; τὰ δεξιά 176.
δεξιολαβεῖν 102.
δεξιολάβος 101.
δέομαι constr. of 198.
δερμάτινος 26.
δεσμός plur. forms of 63.
δεύτερον 250.
δευτερόπρωτος 100.
δή with imperat. 313.
Δημᾶς 103.
διά with gen. 377 sq. 423 sq.; with verbs of *praising* etc. 378; denoting the *causa principalis*? 378; used of time 380; with acc. 398 sq.; in circumlocutions 423; construction of verbs compounded with 431.
διαβεβαιόω 253.
διάβολος without art. 124.
διάγειν sc. τὸν βίον 593.
διαθῆκαι 177.
διαθήκην διατίθεσθαι 225.
διακονεῖν 593.
διαλλάσσειν constr. of 206.
διαπαρατριβή 102.
διαπλεῖν with acc. 431.
διαπονεῖσθαι 23.
διαπορεύεσθαι constr. of 431.
διασκορπίζειν 25.
διατρίβειν sc. τὸν χρόνον 593.
διδάσκειν τινί 223; ἐν 227.
δίδωμι forms of 78, 79, 84; constr. of 180, 197, 198.
διεγείρειν 102.
διέρχεσθαι with acc. and with διά 431.
δικαιοκρισία 25, 99.
δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως 136.
δικαιοσύνη 32; etc. 35; without art. 120; θεοῦ 186; πίστεως 186.
διό 445.
διότι 445.
διορύσσειν 594.
διψᾶν etc. 17, 77; with acc. 204 sq.
διώκειν 30; forms of 84.
διώξω 84.
δοκεῖν alleged pleonasm of 612 sq.
δολιόω 26.
δόμος ellipsis of 592.
δόξα 32; ἡ 108.
δραχμή ellipsis of 592.
δύναμαι aug. of 70; forms of 76, 84; with infin. 321, 327, 333; used absolutely 590, 594; alleged pleonasm of 613.
δυνάμεις 32.
δυναμόω 26.
δύνῃ 76.
δύο inflec. 64; with plur. 177; δύο δύο 249.
δυσί 64.
δυσμαί 176.
δύω, δύνω forms of 84.

δωδεκάφυλος 100.
δῴη 78.
δῶμα 23.
δωρεάν 230.
δώσῃ 79.

ἐάν sometimes ἄν, never ἤν 291; constr. of 291, 293, 294 sq.; ἐὰν . . . εἰ 296; for ἄν after relatives 310; ἐὰν μή in oaths 500; position of 550; supposed ellipsis of 541, 595.
ἑαυτοῦ 150; ἑαυτόν and ἑαυτῷ with the mid. 257.
ἐγάμησα 84.
ἐγγύς constr. of 195, 471; ἐγγὺς εἶναι 465.
ἐγείρομαι 252.
ἐγενήθην 84.
ἐγκαίνια 176.
ἐγκαινίζειν 33.
ἐγκαλεῖν constr. of 203, 431.
ἐγκεντρίζειν constr. of 430.
ἐγκρατεύομαι 25.
ἔγραψα equiv. to γράφω 278.
ἐγώ never unemphatic 152 sq.
ἔδει a real imperf. indic. 283.
ἐδώκαμεν 84.
ἐθελοθρησκεία 100.
ἐθνικῶς 463.
ἐθύθη 44.
-ει in 2d pers. sing. pass. for η 75 sq.
εἰ with subjunc. 36; constr. of 291 sq.; and ἐάν distinguished 295, 296; with ind. fut. 300; for ἐπεί 448; denoting a wish 448; in oaths 500; supposed ellipsis of 595; in direct quest. 508, 509; apparently for ὅτι 542; εἰ ἄρα 445; εἰ δὲ μή γε 583, 605; εἰ καί distinguished from καὶ εἰ 444; εἰ μή 478 sq. 633, rule for use of 479, not used affirm. 500; εἰ οὐ 478 sq., rule for use of 479.
-εια etc. in 1st aor. opt. 76.
εἴγε 448.
εἰδέα 48.
εἴδω *know*, forms of 84; perf. 274.
εἰδωλολάτρης 100.
εἰδωλολατρεία 26.
εἰδωλόθυτον 26, 100.
εἰλίσσειν 22.
εἰμί forms of 79; with part. in periphrasis 343 sq.; with advbs. 465; omission of 584; with εἰς 183 sq.; with gen. 195 sq.; with dat. 210; with pred adj. 515; ἐστί with infin. 320.
-εινος adjectives in 99.
εἰπεῖν forms of 85; fut. 279, 280; εἴρηκε sc. ὁ θεός 522; ἔφη in direct discourse 558; ellipsis of 598; εἰπόν 22, accent 51.
εἴπερ 448.
εἴπως with ind. fut. 300.
εἰρήνη θεοῦ 186.
-εις plural ending 64.
εἰς never ἐς 52; in supposed circumlocution for the nom. 183; as a sign of the dat.? 212; of the acc.? 228, 527; in circumlocutions 228, 424, 527; with infin. how rendered 329; with acc. 396 sq.; used for ἐν? 414; with ἴζειν, καθίζεσθαι etc. 415; εἰς τρίς 422; constr. of verbs compounded with 430.
εἷς and ὁ εἷς 116; εἷς as an indef. art. (τις)? 117; for πρῶτος 32, 248; εἷς καθ' εἷς 249; εἷς . . . οὐ 172; εἷς . . . καὶ εἷς 173; position of 548.
εἰσέρχεσθαι constr. of 427; εἰς τὸν κόσμον 18.
εἴσω, ἔσω 52.
εἶτα 540; before apod. 541.
εἴτε . . . εἴτε 440.
ἐκ in circumlocutions 193, 424; use of with gen. 366 sq.; distinguished from ἀπό 364; with verbs of fulness 201; never put for ἐν 368; constr. of verbs compounded with 429; in local attraction 629.
ἕκαστος always without art. 111; with plur. pred. 516.
ἑκατόνταρχος 61.
ἐκβάλλειν ἔξω 603.
ἐκγαμίζειν 102.
ἐκεῖ for ἐκεῖσε 471.
ἐκεῖνος with noun and art. 110; referring to the nearest subject 157; position of 157, 162; repeated 160.
ἐκεῖσε for ἐκεῖ 472.
ἐκέρδησα 87.
ἐκκακεῖν 25.
ἐκκλησία without art. 122.
ἐκλέγεσθαι ἔν τινι 226.
οἱ ἐκλεκτοί 35, 234.
ἐκμυκτηρίζειν 25.
ἔκπαλαι 24, 422.
ἐκπίπτειν constr. of 427.
ἐκπλήσσεσθαι constr. of 232.

ἔκραξα 87.
ἔκρυβον 88.
ἐκτένεια 25.
ἐκτενῶς 25, 463.
ἐκτὸς εἰ μή 605.
ἐκτρέπειν 251, 429.
ἐκχέω forms of 85; ἐκχεῶ fut. 77.
ἔκτρωμα 25.
ἐκχύνειν 24.
Ἐλαιών or Ἐλαιῶν ? 182.
ἐλάκησα 88.
ἐλαχιστότερος 69.
ἐλεάω 85.
ἐλεεινός 99.
ἐλεέω forms of 85; constr. of 233.
ἔλεος gend. 66.
ἐλευθεροῦν constr. of 196, 197.
ἐλεύσομαι 86.
ἕλκω forms of 86.
ἑλληνίζειν, ἑλληνιστής 28, 94.
ἐλπίζειν constr. of 233, 321, 331, 410.
ἐμός used objectively 153.
ἐμπορεύεσθαι constr. of 222, 429.
ἔμπροσθεν 471.
ἐν and *Beth essentiae* 184, 513; hebraistically for acc. of object ? 226; in alleged circumloc. for gen. 193; alleged sign of the dat. 217; ἐν Χριστῷ 359, 360, 388, 390; with dat. in local use 384; temporal 385; fig. uses 386 sq.; apparently with gen. 384; ἐν ᾧ, ἐν τούτῳ 387; distinguished from διά 389; ἐν ὀνόματί τινος 390; used for εἰς ? 413 sq. 415; originally identical with εἰς 416; in adverbial and other circumlocutions 424; construction of verbs compounded with 429.
ἔνατος 43.
ἐνδύσασθαι Χριστόν 30.
ἔνεγκας 90.
ἕνεκα forms of 43; with infin. 329.
ἐνέπαιξα 88.
ἐνεργεῖν 258, 430.
ἐνέχειν sc. χόλον ? 593.
ἔνι 80, 423.
ἐννενήκοντα 43.
ἐνεός or ἐνεός 44.
ἔνοχος constr. of 180, 202, 210, 213.
ἔνταλμα 25.
ἐντεῦθεν looking forwards 161.
ἐντρέπεσθαι constr. of 221, 429.
ἐντρυφᾶν constr. of 430.
ἐνώπιον 214; τοῦ θεοῦ 32.
ἐνωτίζεσθαι 33.
ἐξάγειν ἔξω 603.
ἐξανατέλλειν 102.
ἐξάπινα 24.
ἐξαστράπτειν 102.
ἐξεκρέμετο 87.
ἐξένευσε 91.
ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος τινός 33.
ἐξ οὗ *whence* 141 sq.
ἐξομολογεῖσθαι 102; constr. of 30, 32, 209
ἐξὸν εἶναι 24.
ἐξορκίζειν 102.
ἐξουδενόω 26.
ἐξουθενεῖν 25.
ἐξυπνίζειν 24.
ἔξω 471.
ἐξῶσεν 90.
ἔοικα 274.
ἐπαγγελίαι 177.
ἐπαγγέλλεσθαι with infin. 331.
ἐπαινέσω 86.
ἐπαινέω forms of 86; constr. of 203.
ἔπαιξα 88.
ἐπαισχύνομαι augm. of 73; constr. of 221.
ἐπάν 297.
ἐπάνω 102, 250.
Ἐπαφρᾶς 103.
ἐπεί 448; with indic. pres. 283.
ἐπεὶ ἄρα 445.
ἐπειδή 448.
ἐπειδήπερ 448.
ἐπεὶ μή 480.
ἐπείπερ 448.
ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο 603.
ἐπέκεινα accent 52.
ἐπεκτείνεσθαι constr. of 431.
ἔπεμψα equiv. to πέμπω 278.
ἐπενδύτης 25.
ἐπέχειν 593.
ἐπηρεάζειν constr. of 221.
ἐπί with gen. 374; with dat. 392; ἐφ' ᾧ 394; ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ. τινος 393; with acc. 407 sq.; with different cases in the same sentence 409; ἐπί τρίς 422; in circumlocutions with gen. and dat. of abstracts 425; constr. of verbs compounded with 430.
ἐπιγαμβρεύειν 26.
ἐπιθυμεῖν constr. of 204, 430.
ἐπικαλοῦμαι 253, 263, 430.
ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι constr. of 202, 430 sq.

ἐπιλησμονή 93.
ἐπιορκέω forms of 86.
ἐπιούσιος 97, 236.
ἐπιποθεῖν constr. of 204, 430.
ἐπιπόθητος 236.
ἐπισκιάζειν constr. of 431.
ἐπιστέλλειν 23.
ἐπιστολαί of a single ep. 176.
ἐπιστρέφεσθαι 26, 251.
ἐπιστροφή 26.
ἐπίταδε accent 52.
ἐπιτιθέναι τινί sc. τὰς χεῖρας 593.
ἐπιφᾶναι 89.
ἐπιφαύσει 90.
ἐπιφέρειν constr. of 431.
ἐπιχειρεῖν pleonastic ? 613.
ἐπουράνια, τά 235.
ἐργάζομαι 72, 222, 259.
ἔργον as a pleonasm ? 615.
ἐρεύγεσθαι 23.
ἔρημος accent 52 ; inflection 69 ; ἡ 106.
ἐρίθεια, ἐριθεία 51, 94.
ἔρις inflection 65.
Ἑρμᾶς 103.
ἐῤῥήθην, ἐῤῥέθην 85.
ἔρχομαι forms of 86 ; ἔρχεται ὥρα, ἵνα 339 ; ὁ ἐρχόμενος 341.
ἐρωτᾶν 22, 30, 32, 335.
ἔσθησις 23.
ἐσθίω forms of 86 ; constr. of 180, 198 sq.
ἔσθω 23, 86.
ἑστάναι 78.
ἔσχατος without art. 131.
ἐσχάτως 463 ; ἔχειν 26.
ἔσω not εἴσω 52 ; 471, 472.
ἐσώτερος 69.
ἕτερος in appos. 530 ; ἑτέρῳ, ἐν 592.
ἔτι in comparison 240 ; position of 553.
ἕτοιμος accent 52 ; with aor. infin. 332.
ἑτοίμως 463.
εὐ augm. of verbs beginning with 71.
εὐαγγελίζειν 24, 35 ; aug. of 71 ; constr. of 180, 213, 223, 227, 229, 260.
εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ 186.
εὐαρέστως 463.
εὐδοκεῖν 25, 101, 212, 222, 232.
εὐθέως position of 554.
εὐθύμως 463.
εὐπερίστατος 236.
εὐλογεῖν 32.
εὐράμην 86.
εὑρίσκω forms of 86 ; constr. of 219 ; εὑρίσκεσθαι for εἶναι ? 616.
εὐσχήμων 23.
Εὔτυχος accent 51.
εὐχαριστεῖν 23, 222.
εὔχεσθαι aug. of 71 ; 212, 259.
-εύω verbs in 92.
ἐφάπαξ 422
ἔφη in direct disc. 558 ; omitted 598.
ἔφθασα 90.
ἔφιδε 45.
ἐφιστάναι constr. of 427.
ἐχθές 24, 45 ; cf. 48.
ἔχω with gen. 202 ; with infin. 333 ; ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχ. 594 ; μὴ ἔχειν 594.
-έω verbs in with ε in the fut. 77.
ἐωνησάμην 70.
ἕως and ἕως οὗ constr. 296 ; ἕως ἄν 308 ; ἕως as a prep. 470 ; ἕως ἄρτι, πότε etc. 471.

ζάω forms of 86 ; constr. of 226, 227.
ζῆλος, τό 65.
Ζηνᾶς 102.
ζήσω 86.
ζητεῖν ψυχήν 33.
ζωὴ αἰώνιος 133.

ἤ in comparisons 240 sq. ; ἤ ... ἤ καί 440 ; never for καί 440, yet cf. 441 ; co-ordinate with οὔτε 491 sq. ; after neg. 508 ; in questions 509 ; repeated 519 ; supposed ellipsis of 595 sq.
ἡγέομαι ὡς 602.
ἤγγισις 24.
ἧκα 87.
ἥκω 87, 274.
ἥλιος anarthrous 119 sq.
ἡμάρτησα 82.
ἥμεθα 80.
ἡμεῖς never unemphatic 153.
ἤμελλε 70.
ἡμέρα ellipsis of 590 ; ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ 463.
ἡμίση, -εα, -εια 65.
ἥμισυ inflection 64.
ἡνίκα constr. of 296 ; ἡνίκα ἄν 297.
ἧξα 87.
ἥρεμος 70.
-ηριον substantives in 96.
ἠρχόμην 86.
Ἡρωδιανός 95.
ἧs for ἦσθα 80.
ἤτοι ... ἤ 440.
ἡττάομαι 260.
ἥτω 79.

ἦφιε 81.
ἦχος, τό 65.

θάλασσα without art. 121.
θάλλω 87.
θάμβος, gen. θάμβου 66.
θανατηφόρος 101.
θάνατος 29; without art. 122.
θαυμάζειν constr. of 232.
θεάομαι 259.
θεατρίζειν 25, 26.
θεόπνευστος 96.
θέλω with inf. 37, 321, 327, 333; θέλω ἤ *malle* 241; not for ἤθελον 284; followed by subjunc. 285, 595; ἵνα 336 sq.; used adverbially? 467; pleonastic? 612 sq.
θεός, θεέ vocative 63; without art. 121 sq.; ellipsis of 522, 588.
θεοστυγής 23; accent 53.
Θευδᾶς 103.
θλῖψις, θλίψις 50.
θρῆσκος accent 50.
θριαμβεύειν 23, 251.
θυμὸς ἀργῆς 611.
θύρα without art. 123; in plur. 176.
θυρεός 23.
-θω verbs in 92.

-ια nouns in 95.
ἰάομαι 259.
ἰδέ and ἴδε 49.
ἴδιος for poss. pron. 153 sq.; added to a pers. pron. 154; position of 548; ἰδίᾳ, κατ' ἰδίαν 591; τὰ ἴδια 592.
ἱερίσσα 24.
Ἰεριχώ 67.
ἱεροσύλημα 25.
ἱερουργεῖν constr. of 222.
Ἱερουσαλήμ form and inflec. 67 sq.; use of art. with 112; plur. 176.
-ίζω fut. of verbs in 75; deriv. of verbs in 91 sq.
ἵημι forms of 80.
Ἰησοῦς inflection 66.
ἱκεσία 24.
ἱλάσκεσθαι constr. of 227.
ἱλαστήριον 96, 592.
ἵλεως 22.
ἱμάτια 176; ellipsis of 591.
ἱματίζω 26.
ἱμείρεσθαι 101; constr. of 204.
ἵνα 449; with ind. pres. 36; constr. of 287 sq.; with subjunc. for imperat. 315; weakened 36, and for infin. 334 sqq.; John's use of 338 sq. 461; is it used ἐκβατικῶς? 457 sq.; ἵνα πληρωθῇ 461; apparently for ὥστε or ὡς after adject. 461; for ὅτι? 462; supposed ellipsis of 285, 595; in breviloquence 620, ἀλλ' ἵνα 620; ἵνα τί *wherefore* 169, sc. γέν. 586.
-ινος adjectives in 99.
Ἰορδάνης art. with 112.
Ἰούδα use of art. with 114.
Ἰουδαία art. with 112.
ἴσα used adverbially 177.
ἰσάγγελος 236.
ἴσος accent 52; ἴσα adv. 177; constr. of 209.
ἱστάνω 87.
ἱστάω 78.
ἵστημι forms of 78, 79, 87; signif. of 252; perf. 274.
Ἰταλία art. with 112.
Ἰωσῆς inflection 66.

καθάπτω 257.
καθαρίζειν constr. of 197.
καθαρός constr. of 197.
καθ' εἷς 249.
κἄθη 81.
κἄθημαι forms of 81; constr. of 431.
καθημερινός 26.
καθίζειν constr. of 415, 431.
κάθου 81.
καθώς 26; καθὼς ... οὕτως 440.
καί 434 sqq.; connecting numerals 250; connecting diff. tenses 280; at the beginning of an apodosis 286, 438; connecting imperatives 311; distinguished from τε 434; uses of 435 sq.; with interrogatives 437; adversative 437; epexegetic 437; meaning *especially*? 438; after a particle of time 438; καὶ ... καί 439; in comparisons 440, 603; never for ἤ 440; καὶ ... δέ 443; καὶ εἰ distinguished from εἰ καί 444; καὶ γάρ 448; καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή 493; in schema κατ' ἐξοχήν 520 sq. 539 sq.; transposed? 560; introducing parenth. 562; anacoluthic use of one for two 576; καὶ ἐγένετο Hebraistically 608.
καιρός without art. 124.
Καισάρεια art. with 112.
καίτοι, καίπερ with part. 344; καίτοιγε 444.
κακία without art. 120.

καλεῖν, ἐπί τινα 410, 593 ; καλεῖσθαι for εἶναι ? 615 ; καλέσω fut. 77.
καλοποιεῖν 25, 26 ; constr. of 222.
καμμύειν 24.
κἄν *vel certe* 584.
Κανᾶ accent 52 ; indecl. 61.
καραδοκεῖν 101.
καρδία as a circumlocution for the pers. pron. 156 ; εὐθεῖα 32.
καρπὸς κοιλίας 33 ; ὀσφύος 33 ; χειλέων 33.
κατά with acc. of pers. pron. equiv. to poss. pron. 154 ; in circum. for gen. 193 ; with gen. 381 sq. ; with acc. 400 sq. ; in local sense 400 ; in temporal 401 ; in distributive 401 ; figuratively 401 sq. ; καθ' ἑαυτόν 401 ; in circumlocutions 425 ; καθ' ὅλου 425 ; constr. of verbs compounded with 431.
κατάβα 79.
κατάγνυμι aug. of 70.
κατακαήσομαι 87.
κατακαίω 87.
κατακαυχᾶσθαι constr. of 203, 432.
κατακρίνειν constr. of 210.
καταλαμβάνω 253.
καταλείπω 87.
καταλιθάζειν 102.
κατάλυμα 25, 93.
κατάνυξις 94.
καταποντίζειν 24.
καταστολή 23.
κατεαγῶ 70.
κατέαξαν 70.
κατείδωλος 236.
κατέναντι 102.
κατενώπιον 102.
κατέχειν εἰς 594.
κατηγορεῖν constr. of 180, 203, 260, 431.
κατόρθωμα 25.
κατώτερος 69.
καυχᾶσθαι constr. of 222, 233.
κείρειν 257.
κεκέρασμαι 87.
κέκτημαι 274.
κελεύειν with infin. 332, 336.
εἰς κενόν 592 ; κενῶς 463.
κεραμικός 99.
κεράννυμι 87.
κεφαλίς 23.
κέρας inflection 65.
κερδαίνω 87.
κήρυξ or κῆρυξ ? 50.
κινέομαι 252.
κλαίω 87 ; constr. of 222.
κλᾶν τὸν ἄρτον 35.
κλαύσω 87.
κλείς inflection 65.
κλείειν τι ἀπό τινος 622.
Κλεόπας 103.
κλέπτω 87.
κλέψω 87.
κληρονομεῖν constr. of 200.
οἱ κλητοί 35.
κλίβανος 22.
κλῖμα acc. 50.
κλινάριον 96.
ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός 33.
κοιμᾶσθαι 267 ; perf. 274.
κοινωνεῖν constr. of 200.
κολλυβιστής 94.
Κολοσσαί spelling 44.
κόλποι 176.
κοράσιον 24.
κόσμιος inflection 68.
κόσμος 26 ; without art. 123.
κράββατος 25, 43.
κράζω 87, 274 ; 3d fut. pass. 279.
κράξω 87.
κρατεῖν constr. of 202.
κρέας inflection 65.
κρέμαμαι 87.
κρῖμα accent 50.
κρούειν 593.
κρύπτω 88 ; constr. of 227 ; mid. 253 ; τι ἀπό τινος 622.
κτάομαι 260 ; perf. 274.
κτίσις 32 ; without art. 123.
κτιστῇ, κτίστῃ 51.
κτίστης accent 51, 94 ; without art. 122.
κυριακός 236.
κύριος κυρίων 18 ; without art. 124.
κύω and κυέω 88.
κωλύειν with gen. 196.
Κῶς, Κῶ 62.

λαβέ, λάβε 49.
λαβών pleonastic ? 607.
λαγχάνειν constr. of 200.
λάθρα 47.
λαῖλαψ not λαίλαψ 50.
λαλιά 23.
λαλεῖν γλωσσαῖς 594.
λαμβάνειν constr. of 202 ; τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν 237.
λαμπάς 23.
λάσκω 88.

λατρεύειν 593.
λέγειν constr. of 212; ellipsis of 587; λέγει sc. ὁ θεός 522, 588; λέγων used absol. 535 sq.; pleonastically 602.
Λευΐ or Λευΐς inflection 66.
λιθοβολεῖν 25, 26, 102.
λιμός, ἡ, 22, 36, 63.
λογία 25.
λογίζεσθαι εἰς 228.
λογίζομαι 259; ὡς 602.
λοιβή 23.
λοιπόν, τό 592.
λουεῖν ἀπὸ 197; λούεσθαι 253.
Λουκᾶς 103.
λυχνία 24.
Λύδδα inflection 61.
λύειν 32; constr. of 197.
λυτροῦν constr. of 197; act. and mid. 253.

-μα substantives in 25, 93.
μαθητεύειν 23; constr. of 221, 251.
Μακεδονία art. with 112.
μακράν 230.
μακρόθεν 463.
μᾶλλον in comparison 240, 603; πολὺ μᾶλλον 633.
μάμμη 25.
Μανασσῆ inflection 67.
μανθάνειν with infin. and part. 347.
μαρτυρίαν μαρτυρεῖν 225.
μάταιος inflection 68.
μάτην 230.
μαχαίρης 62.
μεγαλύνειν 30.
μεγαλωσύνη 26.
μεθύσκεσθαι constr. of 201, 217, 252.
μέθυσος 23.
μειζότερος 27, 69.
μέλει constr. of 205.
μελίσσιος 24.
μέλλειν with inf. 37, 334; aug. of 70.
μεμιαμμένοι 88.
μέν 443; position of 558, 559; without δέ 575 sq.; μὲν ... ἀλλά 443; μὲν ... δέ 540; μὲν ... ἔπειτα 576; μὲν ... καί 576.
μενοῦνγε 558.
μέντοι 444, 558, 559.
μεσημβρία without art. 121.
μεσιτεύειν 25.
μέσος without art. 123, 131; μέσον as an adv. 471.
μετά with gen. 376; distinguished from σύν 391; with acc. 403; constr. of verbs compounded with 432; μετὰ τοῦτο or ταῦτα 540.
μετανοεῖν ἀπό or ἐκ 622.
μεταξύ, ἐν τῷ 592.
μετασταθῆναι with gen. 196.
μετέχω constr. of 180, 201.
μετοικεσία 24.
μετρεῖν ἐν 218.
μετριοπαθεῖν 101.
μέχρι and μέχρις 471.
μή etc. distinguished from οὐ 473 sq.; use of 476 sqq.; with imperat. 476; in conditional clauses 477 sq.; in relative clauses 480 sq.; with infin. 481, with participles 482 sq.; apparently for οὐ 486 sq.; in continued negation 487 sq.; in antith. 495 sq.; in independ. prop. 500 sq.; in prohibitions 502; in depend. prop. 502 sq.; after ὅρα, βλέπε etc. 503, 601; after verbs of fearing 505; in questions 511; ellipsis with 596; redundant 604; in εἰ μή 633; in ἐκτὸς εἰ μή 605; in εἰ δὲ μή γε 605; μὴ ... ἀλλά 595; μὴ ... ἀλλὰ καί 498; μὴ οὐ 511; μὴ ... πᾶς for μηδείς 171.
μηδέ 487 sqq.; must be preceded by μή 489; distinguished from καὶ μή 493; μηδὲ ... μήτε 492.
μηθέν 44.
μηκέτι supposed use of for μή 618.
μήν 434, 443.
μήποτε 480.
μήπως with indic. pret. 504 sq.; with both indic. and subjunc. 505.
μήτε 487 sqq.; used after μηδέ? 492.
μήτηρ without art. 122; omitted 190.
μιαίνω 88.
μιμνήσκεσθαι with gen. or acc. 180, 628.
μισθαποδοσία 24.
μισθωτός 51.
μνημονεύειν constr. of 205.
μοιχαλίς 24.
-μονή substantives in 93.
μονόφθαλμος 24.
μόνος without art. 131; supposed ellipsis of 495, 595.
-μος substantives in 93.
μοσχοποιεῖν 26.
μυκτηρίζειν ἐν 629.
μύριοι, μυρίοι 53.
μῶρος accent 52.
Μωϋσῆς spelling 44; inflection 66.

ν in the accusative 66.
ν ἐφελκυστικόν 41.
νεκροί without art. 123.
νηπιάζω 92.
νῖκος 24.
νίπτω 88.
νοῖ, νοός 62.
νομοθετεῖν 261.
νόμος without art. 123.
νοσσιά 24.
νοσσοί 24.
νουθεσία 24.
νοῦς inflection 62.
Νυμφᾶς 102.
νύμφη 32.
νυνί 23; with imperat. 313.
νυχθήμερον 25.
νῶτος ὁ and *τό* 63.

ξενίζεσθαι constr. of 209.
ξενοδοχεύς 25.
ξηρά, ἡ 18, 592.
ξύλον 23.
ξυράω 24.

ὁ with participle derisively 135; with an acc. elliptically 589; *ὁ μὲν ... ὁ δέ* 104; *ὁ δέ* without *ὁ μέν* 104; *ὁ ὢν κ. ὁ ἦν κ. ὁ ἐρχόμενος* 68.
ὅ for *δι' ὅ* 142; before a clause 168.
ὅδε apparently equiv. to *ὁ δεῖνα* 162.
ὁδός 32; ellipsis of 590; *ὁδὸν θαλάσσης* 231.
οἰκοδεσποτεῖν 25.
οἰκοδεσπότης 25.
οἰκοδομεῖν 30; augm. of 71; pass. 263; *οἶκον* 603.
οἰκοδομή 24, etc. 35.
οἰκτείρω 88.
οἰκτιρμοί 176.
ὀλίγος without art. 131.
ὀλοθρεύω, ὀλεθρεύω 92.
ὁλοκαύτωμα 33.
ὁλόκληρος 25.
ὅλος without art. 131.
Ὀλυμπᾶς 103.
ὀμείρεσθαι or *ὀμείρεσθαι* 101.
ὁμιλεῖν constr. of 212.
ὀμνύω 88; constr. of 222.
ὁμοιάζειν 25.
ὁμοῖος accent 52; inflec. 68; constr. of 180, 195, 209.
ὁμοιόω ὡς 602.
ὁμολογεῖν constr. of 39, 209, 226.
ὁμολογία 35.
ὅμως 344, 444; transposed 553.
ὀνειδίζειν with the acc. 222.
ὀνειδισμός 24.
ὄνομα as an alleged pleonasm 615; *ἐν ὀνόματί τινος* 390; *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόμ.* 394.
ὀνομάζεσθαι not *esse* 615 sq.
ὄπισθεν 471.
ὀπίσω 471.
ὁποῖος 543.
ὁπόσος 543.
ὅπου for *ὅποι* 471, 472; 510.
ὀπτασία 24.
ὅπως constr. of 287 sq. 542; with *ἄν* 309 sq.; *ὅρα ὅπ.* 338; meaning and use 449; *ὅπως πληρωθῇ* 461; not equiv. to *ὥστε* 462; in indirect quest. 510; supposed ellipsis of 285, 595.
ὁράω 88; perf. in sense of pres. 274.
ὀργή, ἡ sc. *τοῦ θεοῦ* 594.
ὀργίζεσθαι constr. of 232.
ὀρέγεσθαι 252.
ἡ ὀρεινή 591.
ὀρέων 64.
ὀρθοποδεῖν 26, 102.
ὀρθοτομεῖν 26.
ὀρθρίζω 26, 33.
ὀρθρινός 25.
ὅρκον or *ὅρκῳ* 226, 603; *εἰς* 397.
ὁρκωμοσία, ἡ 24.
ὁροθεσία 25.
ὅς supposed remote reference of 157 sq.; for interrog. 167; position of clause with 167 sq.; for demons. 168; before a clause 168; *ὃς ἄν* with the moods 306 sq.; *ὃς μὲν ... ὃς δέ* 105; *ὅ* for *δι' ὅ* 142.
ὁσάκις ἄν 297, 308.
-οσαν in 3d plur. hist. tenses 77.
ὅσον ὅσον 247.
ὀστέα, ὀστέων 63.
ὅστις occurs in N. T. only in nom. 163; *ὅστις ἄν* 306, 480, 543.
ὀστράκινος 26.
-οσύνη substantives in 95.
ὅταν with indic. 36; with the moods 297, 308, 309.
ὅτε with the indic. 296; with the subjunc. 298; confounded with *ὅτι* 457; *ὁπότε* constr. of 296.
ὅτι with infin. 339, 573; meaning and use of 445, 449; not equiv. to *διό* 456,

nor διὰ τί 456, nor *quanquam* 457, nor ὅτε 457, nor *profecto* 457, nor ὅς 457; 542; pleonastic? 597; before the orat. rect. 605; ὡς ὅτι 618.

ὅ,τι mode of writing 46; as interrog. in N. T. 167, 168.

οὐ etc. distinguished from μή 473 sqq.; combining with verbs 476; with nouns 476; in conditional sentences (εἰ οὐ) 477; after ὅτι and ἐπεί *because* 480; in relative clauses 480 sq.; with participles 485; in continued negation 488sq.; οὐ ... οὔτε 490; in antith. (οὐ ... ἀλλά) 495, 497; οὐ ... ἀλλὰ καί 498; οὐ μόνον ... ἀλλά 498; with fut. ind. 315, 501; οὐ μή 505 sq.; Dawes's rule 507; with pres. indic. 507; in questions 510 sq.; οὐκ ἄρα 511; οὐ μή disting. from μὴ οὐ 511 sq.; οὐ πάντως and πάντως οὐ 554; οὐ πάνυ 554; οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καί 583 sq.; not for οὔπω 596; οὐχ ὅτι ... ἀλλά 597; οὐχ οἷον ὅτι 597; οὐ ... πᾶς 30, 171 sq.; οὐ πᾶς 171.

οὔ *no* 476.

οὖ *whither* 471, 591.

οὐαί, ἡ 179.

οὐδέ without a preceding neg. 487; in continued negation 487; must be preceded by οὐ 489, 500; οὐδὲ ... οὐδέ 489; after οὔτε 491; distinguished from καὶ οὐ 493, and from οὔτε 487, 494; οὐδὲ ... δέ 495; οὐδέ *ne ... quidem* 500; οὐδὲ μή 506, 539 sq.

οὐδὲ εἷς 173.

οὐδείς ἐστιν ὅς with indic. 300.

οὐθείς etc. 44.

οὐκέτι supposed half pleonastic use of 618.

οὔκουν and οὐκοῦν 512.

οὖν uses of 444; allied to δέ 455; not equiv. to *but* 455; nor *for* 455; nor superfluous 455; as connective 539 sq.; before apod.? 541, 542; position of 558.

οὐράνιος inflection 68.

οὐρανόθεν 463.

οὐρανός without art. 121; οὐρανοί 176.

οὔτε ... οὔτε 487 sq. 540; οὔτε ... οὔτε ... καὶ οὐ 489; οὔτε after οὐ 490; οὔτε ... ἤ 491; οὔτε after οὐδέ? 492; diff. between and οὐδέ 494; οὔτε ... καί 494.

οὗτος with a noun and art. 110; remote reference of 157; repetition of 159 sq.; looking forwards 161; in expressions of time 161; position of 162, 548; ταῦτα 162; ταῦτα πάντα 548.

οὕτως and οὕτω 41; repeated 160; looking forwards 161; for οὗτος? 465; before apod. 541; after condit. clauses 541; with part. 541; in anaphora 618.

ὀφείλημα 32; ὀφειλήματα ἀφιέναι 30, 33.

ὄφελον constr. of 301 sq.

ὀψάριον 23.

ὀψέ 471.

ὄψησθε 88.

ὄψιμος 24.

ὀψώνιον 23; -ια 176.

-οω verbs in 91.

παθητός 97.

παιδάριον 96.

παιδεύειν 22.

παιδιόθεν 26, 463.

παίζω 88.

παῖς 30.

πάλιν position of 548, 554; δεύτερον or ἐκ δευτέρου 604; ἄνωθεν 604.

πανδοχεύς 25.

πανοικί 26, 44.

πάντα ταῦτα and ταῦτα πάντα 548.

πάντη, πάντῃ 47.

πάντων with the compar. 242; with the superl. 248.

πάντοτε 26.

παρά in comparisons 240; distinguished from ἀπό 364 sq.; after passives 365; with gen. 365 sq.; with dat. 394; with acc. 403; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.

παραβάτης 26.

παραβολεύεσθαι 93.

παραδιατριβή 102.

παραδίδοσθαι absol. 35.

παραθήκη, παρακαταθήκη 102.

παραινεῖν constr. of 223.

παρακαλεῖν 22; with infin. 332; constr. with 335.

παραλαμβάνειν εἰς 622.

παραπλησίον 471.

παρασκευάζομαι 253.

παραφρονία 24.

παρεμβολή 22.

παρέχειν, παρέχεσθαι 257.

Παρμενᾶς 103.

παῤῥησία 23.

πᾶς art. with 111; πᾶς ... οὐ (μή) 172; πάντη and πάντῃ 47; πάντα and τὰ

πάντα 116; *πάντων* with the compar. 242; with the superl. 248; *πάντα ταῦτα* and *ταῦτα πάντα* 548; *παντί, ἐν* 592.
πάσχα 68.
πάσχειν 35, 594; constr. of 412.
πατήρ without art. 122; ellipsis of 190.
πατριάρχης 26.
Παῦλος use of art. with 113.
παύεσθαι with gen. 196, 262; *παύομαι* mid. 253, 263.
παχύνειν 18.
πείθειν ἵνα 338.
πείθομαι 253.
πειθός 24, 96.
πεινᾶν etc. 77; constr. of 204 sq.
πειράω 91.
πεισμονή 93 sq.
πέλαγος τῆς θαλάσσης 611.
πελεκίζω 26.
πέμπω in the preterite 278.
πεντεκοστή 26.
πεπειραμένος 91.
πέποιθα constr. of 214, 233, 410.
πεποίθησις 25.
πέρατα τῆς γῆς 30.
περί in circumlocutions ? 192 sq.; with gen. 372; distinguished from *ὑπέρ* 373, 411 sq.; with acc. 406; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.
περιάγειν 257.
περίκειμαι constr. of 229.
περιπατεῖν 32.
περισπᾶσθαι 23.
περισσοτέρως 70, 243.
πετάομαι 24.
πέτομαι 88.
πηχῶν 65.
πιάζω 22.
πίεσαι 88.
Πιλᾶτος accent 52; use of art. with 113.
πίνω 88; fut. *πίομαι* 90.
πίπτω 89.
πιστεύειν constr. of 213, 229, 233, 260.
πιστικός 97.
πίστις etc. 35; without art. 120.
πλατύνειν τὴν καρδίαν 30.
πλεῖν with acc. 224.
πλέον 596.
πλεονεξία without art. 120.
πληγή ellipsis of 589.
πλήν 508.
πληροῦν, πληροῦσθαι 180, 201, 217, 260.
πληροφορία 25.
πλησίον, ὁ 24, 130, 471.
πλησμονή 94.
πλοός 62.
πλούσιος constr. of 201.
πλοῦτος gend. 65; *πλοῦτον πλουτεῖν* 225.
πνεῦμα etc. without art. 122; *τὸ πνευματικόν* 592.
ποία 22.
ποιεῖν, ποιεῖσθαι 256; not pleonastic 609; *ποιεῖν ἔλεος μετά τ.* 33; *ποιεῖν ἵνα* 337.
ποίμνιον accent 52.
πολεμεῖν μετά τ. 180, 214.
πολιτεύεσθαι 262.
πολλάκις position of 553.
πολυμερῶς 463.
πολύς with other adj. 525, e.g. *πολλὰ καὶ ἄλλα* and *ἄλλα πολλά* 525; *πολλοί* and *οἱ πολλοί* 110; *πολύ* in comparison 240; *πολὺ μᾶλλον* 633; *πλέον* 596.
πολυτρόπως 463.
πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω 30.
πόρρω εἶναι 465.
ποταπός 24.
πότε for *ὁπότε* 510.
πότηρον ... ἤ 509.
ποτήριον 32.
ποῦ 471, 508, 510.
πούς accent 50.
πρᾷος 47.
πραΰς, πραΰτης 45.
πρηνής 22.
πρίν with subjunc. 297; with infin. 330, 332.
πρό 372; with gen. of time 557; constr. of verbs compounded with 432.
προβάλλειν 593.
προβατική sc. *πύλη* 592.
προβλέπειν, προβλέπεσθαι 258.
προέχεσθαι 264.
προκόπτειν 251.
πρός for the simple dat. ? 212, 214; with gen. 373; with dat. 395; with acc. 404 sq.; in circum. 425; verbs compounded with 432.
προσέρχεσθαι constr. of 427, 432.
προσέχειν τινί sc. *τόν νοῦν* 593.
προσήλυτος 24, 26, 97.
προσκυνεῖν constr. of 36, 210, 593.
προστίθημι adverbial constr. of 468.
προσφάγιον 25.
προσφάτως 463.
προσφέρειν constr. of 427, 432, 593.
προσφωνεῖν with dat. 36; and acc. 432.

προσωποληπτεῖν 33, 48, 101.
προσωπολήπτης 101.
προσωποληψία 48, 101.
πρόσωπον without art. 122, cf. 174; Hebr. use of 607; πρόσωπον λαμβάνειν 30, 33.
προφητεύειν augm. of 71.
πρύμνα 22.
πρωΐ 47.
πρωϊνός 26.
πρώρης 62.
πρῶτος for πρότερος 244; εἷς for 248 sq.
πτύον 24.
πτῶμα 23.
πύλη ellipsis of 592.
πῶς 508, 510.

ρ past tenses of verbs beginning with 74.
Ῥαμᾶ indecl. 61.
ῥαντίζειν 24, 74.
ῥάπισμα 25.
ῥαφίς 25.
ῥεύσω 89.
ῥέω 89.
ῥῆμα without art. 123.
ῥήσσω 22.
ῥύεσθαι constr. of 197.
ῥύμη 22, 23.
Ῥώμη use of art. with 112.

σ and s 41 sq.
σάββατον inflec. 63; τὰ σάβ. 177.
σαλπίζω 89; σαλπίζει sc. ὁ σαλπ. 522.
Σαμάρεια art. with 112.
σάρκινος and σαρκικός 98.
πᾶσα σάρξ 33.
σαροῦν 24.
σεβάζεσθαι 23.
σημαίνω 89.
σθενόω 26.
Σίλας 103.
σινιάζω 26, 92.
-σις substantives in 93.
σιτομέτριον 25.
σῖτος inflection 63.
σκανδαλίζειν 33.
σκάνδαλον 32.
σκέπτομαι 89.
σκηνοπηγία 26, 101.
σκληροκαρδία 26, 99.
σκληροτράχηλος 26, 99.
σκληρύνω 92.
σκορπίζειν 22.
σκότος, ὁ 22, 66.
-σκω verbs in 92.
Σολομών inflec. and accent 67.
Σπανία 25.
σπείρης 62.
σπέρμα 30.
σπῖλος 25.
σπλάγχνα 18; with gen. 611.
σπλαγχνίζεσθαι 30, 33; constr. of 221, 233.
σπουδάζω 89.
στάμνος 23.
στέγειν 23.
στήκω 24, 26; with dat. 210.
στηρίζω 89; στηρίζειν πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ 33.
στόμα 18, 30.
στρέφειν for an adverb? 469.
στρηνιᾶν 25.
στρωννύειν ἑαυτῷ 594.
σύ when expressed 152.
συγγενίς 69.
συγκρίνειν 23.
συγκυρία 24.
συλλαμβάνειν *concipere* 593.
συμβάλλειν τινί or πρός τινα sc. λόγους 593.
συμμαθητής 25.
συμπολίτης 25.
σύν 391; distinguished from μετά 391; constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
-συνη substantives in 95.
συνίημι forms of 81.
συνιοῦσι 81.
συνίστημι 23.
συντίθεσθαι 254.
Συρία art. with 112.
Συροφοίνισσα, Συροφοινίκισσα 95.
σχολή 23.
σώζειν constr. of 197.
Σώπατρος 103.

ταμεῖον 24, 94.
ταπεινοφροσύνη 26, 99.
ταπεινόφρων 236.
ταρταροῦν 25.
ταῦτα referring to a single object 162; ταῦτα πάντα and πάντα ταῦτα 548.
ταχύς comparison of 69.
τε distinguished from καί 434; τε . . . τε 439; τε . . . δέ 439; τε καί 439; τε γάρ 448, 539 sq.; position of 559; with πρῶτον 576.
τεκνίον accent 52.
τέκνον with gen. of abstracts 238.
τελέσω fut. 77.
τέρας 65.

τέσσερες etc. 43.
τέτευχε 89.
-της, -οτης substantives in 94.
τίθημι forms of 78.
Τίμων accent 51.
τίς, τί in indirect quest. and for the relat. 168 sq.; for πότερος 169; τίς ἐστιν ὅς with indic. 300, and οὐ 481; τί used adverbially 142; in exclamations 142; τί ὅτι 585.
τις, τι (indef.) not used for εἴ τις 169; with substs. and adjs. 170 sq.; position of 170, 559; τι aliquid (*magni*) 170; του, τῳ not used in N. T. 171; τι as acc. with verbs 227.
Τίτος and Τῖτος 52; never has art. 113.
τό before entire clauses 109; before a word as a sound 109, 179; before the infin. 320; τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν and the like 230.
τοι 434.
τοιγαροῦν 445.
τοίνυν 445, 559.
τοιοῦτος use of art. with 111.
τολμᾶν alleged pleonasm of 612 sq.
-τος verbals in 96 sq.
τότε as a connective 540; before apod. 541.
τοῦτο used adverbially 142; τοῦτο μὲν ... τοῦτο δέ so used 142; τοῦτ' ἔστιν epexegetical 530.
τρίτον 250.
Τρόφιμος accent 51.
τροχός accent 54.
Τρωάς use of art. with 112.
τυγχάνω 89; constr. of 200; supposed to be pleonastic 609.
τυχόν 355.
-τωσαν in imperat. 76 sq.

ὕαλος 22.
ὑβρίζειν with the acc.
ὑγιῆ accusative 64.
ὕδωρ ellipsis of 591.
ὑετός ellipsis of 592.
υἱὸς θανάτου 33; υἱός with abstr. gen. 238; supposed to be omitted 190, 593; ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου not equiv. to ἐγώ 144.
Ὑμέναιος accent 51.
-υνω verbs in 92.
ὑπακούειν εἰς 165.
ὑπάρχειν with part. 350.
ὑπέρ with gen. 382 sq.; distinguished from περί 383; with acc. 403; as an adverb 423; constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
ὑπεράνω 422.
ὑπερέκεινα 463.
ὑπερλίαν 422.
ὑπερῷον 96.
ὑπό with gen. 364, 368 sq.; confounded with ἀπό 370 sq.; with acc. 407; constr. of verbs compounded with 433.
ὑποκάτω 422.
ὑπομιμνήσκειν constr. of 227.
ὑποπιάζω for ὑπωπιάζω 43.
ὑποπόδιον 26.
ὑπωπιάζω 43.
ὑστερεῖν 196, 260.
ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ 215.

φαγεῖν 89; constr. of 198 sq.
φάγεσαι 89.
φάγος accent 51.
φαίνω 89; φανῆναι constr. of 233.
φαύσκω 90.
φείδεσθαι constr. of 180, 205.
φειδομένως 99.
φειδός 96.
φέρω 90.
φεύγειν constr. of 223.
Φῆλιξ accent 52.
φησί sc. ὁ θεός 522, 588; in direct discourse 558; ellipsis of, or of ἔφη 598.
φθάνειν 23, 90.
φιάλη 22.
φοβεῖσθαι constr. of 223.
φοίνιξ or φοῖνιξ? 50.
φορέσω fut. 77 sq.
φρυάσσειν 24.
φυείς 90.
φυλακίζω 26.
φυλακτήριον 26.
φυλάσσειν νόμον 30; φυλακάς 225; φυλάσσεσθαι constr. of 223; signification of 253.
φυσιοῦσθαι 24.
φύω intrans. 22, 252; forms of 90.
φωνεῖν φωνῇ 226.

χάρις ὑμῖν etc. 549.
χαίρω 90; constr. of 210, 232; χαίρειν in salutation 316.
χαρήσομαι 90.
χαρίζομαι 90, 261, 264.
χαρίσομαι 90.
χεῖλος 18, 30, 32.

χειλέων uncontr. 64.
χείρ ellipsis of 592.
Χερουβίμ 68.
χορτάζειν 23.
χρεωφειλέτης 44.
χρήζειν constr. of 200.
χρηματίζειν 23, 260.
χρῆσθαι constr. of 209 sq.
χρίειν constr. of 227.
χρῖσμα accent 50.
Χριστιανός 95.
Χριστός and ὁ Χριστός 118; supposed use of to intensify 248.
χρόνος *year* 177.
χρυσοδακτύλιος 26.
-χυσία 93 note.
χώρα ellipsis of 591.
χωρίζειν constr. of 197.
χωρίς 471; χωρίς τινος εἶναι 465.

ψεύδεσθαι constr. 212.
ψεῦσμα 24.
ψήφισμα ψηφίζεσθαι 225.
ψιθυριστής 24.
ψιχίον 24.
ψυχή never redundant 156; τὸ ψυχικόν 592.
ψωμίζειν 23; with the acc. 226 note.
-ω in the acc. 62.
ὠδίν 65.
ὠθέω 90.
ἄν as an imperf. part. 341.
ὠνέομαι aug. of 70, 90.
ὠνησάμην 70, 90.
ὠτάριον 24, 96.
ὥρα without art. 124; ellipsis of 591 sq.
ὡρώμην 88.
ὡς (not ὥς 462) constr. of 296, 448, 449; with infin. 318; always *as* (not οὕτως) 462; before a series 519; before a pred. 527; supposed pleonastic 617; force of, particularly before gen. abs. 617; with a prep. of direction 617 sq.; ὡς . . . καί 440; ὡς ὅτι 618; ὡς (ὥσπερ) . . . οὕτως 440; ὡς ἄν 308, 309 note; ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν 317, 449.
ὡσάμην 71.
ὥσπερ in prot. without apod. 599.
ὥστε constr. of 301, 318, 327; with a negative 480.
ὠτίον 25.
ὠφελεῖν constr. of 227.
ὠφέλιμος constr. of 213.

III. INDEX OF PASSAGES IN THE N.T. EXPLAINED OR CITED.

The Figures refer to Pages; those followed by an Asterisk indicate passages not merely referred to or quoted, but commented upon.

Matt. i. 1 125
Matt. i. 3 366
Matt. i. 6 67, 190
Matt. i. 10 67
Matt. i. 11 187*, 375*
Matt. i. 12 187*
Matt. i. 16 366
Matt. i. 17 110*, 370
Matt. i. 18 113, 192, 208*, 330, 368, 455*
„ „ „ 465*, 527, 616*
Matt. i. 19 330
Matt. i. 20 391*, 401*
Matt. i. 21 141, 150, 182
Matt. i. 22 461, 562, 563
Matt. i. 24 436
Matt. i. 25 107, 182, 296, 436

Matt. ii. 1 113, 139
Matt. ii. 2 55, 155, 318*, 446*
Matt. ii. 3 68, 111*, 113, 344, 376
Matt. ii. 4 75, 110, 266*, 365
Matt. ii. 6 114, 429
Matt. ii. 7 106
Matt. ii. 8 287, 607
Matt. ii. 9 104, 275, 296, 473, 542
Matt. ii. 10 66, 224
Matt. ii. 12 260, 428, 481
Matt. ii. 13 79, 267, 434
Matt. ii. 14 104, 428
Matt. ii. 16 365, 370, 401*
Matt. ii. 17 61
Matt. ii. 18 222
Matt. ii. 20 175, 446*
Matt. ii. 22 206, 260, 364*, 375, 471, 472

Matt. iii. 3 61
Matt. iii. 4 108, 370, 406*, 523
Matt. iii. 5 68, 268, 438*
Matt. iii. 6 528
Matt. iii. 7 409
Matt. iii. 8 206, 444
Matt. iii. 9 151
Matt. iii. 10 110, 266*, 444
Matt. iii. 11 75, 217, 266*, 337, 412*, 630
Matt. iii. 12 75, 149*
Matt. iii. 13 325
Matt. iii. 14 269, 436*
Matt. iii. 15 269
Matt. iii. 16 147*, 151*, 369*
Matt. iii. 17 132, 232, 278*, 586

Matt. iv. 1 106*, 374, 392, 428
Matt. iv. 3 334*, 541
Matt. iv. 4 87, 280*, 377, 389*, 392
Matt. iv. 5 622
Matt. iv. 6 373
Matt. iv. 10 210
Matt. iv. 11 521
Matt. iv. 12 428
Matt. iv. 15 121, 187*, 231*, 590
Matt. iv. 16 147, 247, 602
Matt. iv. 17 422
Matt. iv. 18 177, 403*, 417*, 446
Matt. iv. 19 228, 606
Matt. iv. 21 113, 132, 190
Matt. iv. 23 131, 132, 145, 186, 426, 539
Matt. iv. 24 110, 436, 527, 539
Matt. iv. 25 67, 420, 520, 539

Matt. v. 1 115, 428
Matt. v. 2 608
Matt. v. 3 195, 215, 551, 585
Matt. v. 4 200, 551
Matt. v. 5 551, 585

Matt. v. 6 205*, 551, 585
Matt. v. 7 551, 585
Matt. v. 8 215, 551, 585
Matt. v. 9 122, 229, 551, 585, 615
Matt. v. 10 120, 551, 585
Matt. v. 11 222, 551
Matt. v. 13 114, 293, 388, 541
Matt. v. 15 78, 436
Matt. v. 16 287
Matt. v. 17 127
Matt. v. 18 172, 432, 506, 518, 542,
" " " 552, 612*
Matt. v. 19 160, 246*, 310, 543, 615
Matt. v. 20 245*, 477, 506
Matt. v. 21 85, 210, 219*, 316, 502, 522
Matt. v. 22 111*, 209, 213*, 455, 621
Matt. v. 23 455*
Matt. v. 25 79, 296*, 502
Matt. v. 26 506
Matt. v. 27 316
Matt. v. 28 204
Matt. v. 31 85
Matt. v. 32 56, 496
Matt. v. 33 85, 86, 316
Matt. v. 34 222, 389*, 481, 488
Matt. v. 35 397*
Matt. v. 36 76, 490
Matt. v. 37 476
Matt. v. 38 588, 598*
Matt. v. 39 168, 280*, 481
Matt. v. 40 147, 209
Matt. v. 41 280*
Matt. v. 42 254*
Matt. v. 44 222
Matt. v. 45 445*, 457*
Matt. v. 46 266
Matt. v. 48 315, 540

Matt. vi. 1 31, 121, 259, 329*, 405, 583, 605
Matt. vi. 2 275*, 287, 540
Matt. vi. 3 502, 592
Matt. vi. 4 148, 235
Matt. vi. 5 275*, 310, 315, 467*, 502
Matt. vi. 6 94, 132, 433
Matt. vi. 7 387*, 501
Matt. vi. 8 209, 329*, 372
Matt. vi. 9 121, 533*
Matt. vi. 10 440
Matt. vi. 11 97*
Matt. vi. 12 81, 152, 448*
Matt. vi. 13 197, 501
Matt. vi. 16 56, 275*, 638
Matt. vi. 17 143, 253
Matt. vi. 18 477
Matt. vi. 19 501, 594*
Matt. vi. 20 488, 489
Matt. vi. 22 114
Matt. vi. 24 116, 202, 440
Matt vi. 25 156, 209, 299, 488
Matt. vi. 26 57, 430, 487*, 514
Matt. vi. 27 432
Matt. vi. 28 373, 488
Matt. vi. 29 110
Matt. vi. 30 341
Matt. vi. 31 519
Matt. vi. 32 200, 548*
Matt. vi. 34 209, 517, 590

Matt. vii. 1 476, 477, 501
Matt. vii. 2 165, 388, 412, 429, 522
Matt. vii. 4 285, 429
Matt. vii. 6 388, 487*, 503
Matt. vii. 7 57, 522, 552, 593*
Matt. vii. 8 266
Matt. vii. 9 169*, 227, 310, 512*, 568, 628
Matt. vii. 10 440, 441*
Matt. vii. 11 139
Matt. vii. 12 336*, 455
Matt. vii. 13 73
Matt. vii. 14 143*
Matt. vii. 15 384
Matt. vii. 16 279*, 370, 372*, 411, 420,
" " " 511, 522*
Matt. vii. 18 488
Matt. vii. 21 171*
Matt. vii. 22 71, 110, 510*
Matt. vii. 23 370, 426, 427
Matt. vii. 24 71, 155, 209. 225, 279*, 574
Matt. vii. 25 73, 275, 432, 436, 539
Matt. vii. 27 436
Matt. vii. 28 296, 393, 608
Matt. vii. 29 348, 617*

Matt. viii. 1 147, 220*, 367, 602
Matt. viii. 2 76, 549
Matt. viii. 3 607
Matt. viii. 4 106, 146*, 147*, 253*
Matt. viii. 5 61
Matt. viii. 7 607
Matt. viii. 8 57, 61, 155, 259, 335, 337, 407
Matt. viii. 9 407*
Matt. viii. 11 176, 552
Matt. viii. 12 106
Matt. viii. 13 61, 259
Matt. viii. 19 117, 310, 576
Matt. viii. 20 299*, 510

Matt. viii. 21 576*, 638
Matt. viii. 22 330, 576
Matt. viii. 23 429, 539
Matt. viii. 24 539
Matt. viii. 25 539
Matt. viii. 28 220, 366, 480
Matt. viii. 29 87, 124, 330, 372
Matt. viii. 30 188
Matt. viii. 31 292, 545
Matt. viii. 32 311*, 381
Matt. viii. 33 416
Matt. viii. 34 110, 338

Matt. ix. 1 154, 539
Matt. ix. 2 80, 374, 539
Matt. ix. 3 539
Matt. ix. 4 169, 539
Matt. ix. 5 80, 169
Matt. ix. 6 47, 374, 563*, 580*, 620*
Matt. ix. 8 111, 175*
Matt. ix. 9 608
Matt. ix. 10 608
Matt. ix. 12 495
Matt. ix. 13 66, 271*, 495, 496*
Matt. ix. 14 227, 518
Matt. ix. 15 408*, 427, 614*
Matt. ix. 16 394
Matt. ix. 17 605
Matt. ix. 18 117, 442, 545, 607
Matt. ix. 20 230
Matt. ix. 22 183, 370, 549
Matt. ix. 25 296
Matt. ix. 27 221
Matt. ix. 29 401*
Matt. ix. 30 72, 501
Matt. ix. 31 104
Matt. ix. 34 389
Matt. ix. 35 131, 145, 186, 548, 610
Matt. ix. 36 75, 236, 349
Matt. ix. 38 198, 338

Matt. x. 1 185
Matt. x. 2 132
Matt. x. 4 113
Matt. x. 5 187*
Matt. x. 8 537
Matt. x. 9 489, 493
Matt. x. 10 194, 206, 585
Matt. x. 11 307*, 308, 543
Matt. x. 13 293
Matt. x. 14 129, 429, 488
Matt. x. 16 413
Matt. x. 17 213
Matt. x. 18 407
Matt. x. 19 168, 299, 309
Matt. x. 20 108, 497, 513
Matt. x. 21 64, 213, 409, 514
Matt. x. 23 506
Matt. x. 24 403
Matt. x. 25 337*, 628*
Matt. x. 26 300*, 481, 639
Matt. x. 27 85, 374, 455, 543
Matt. x. 28 83, 223, 439
Matt. x. 29 172*, 206, 407
Matt. x. 30 131
Matt. x. 32 226*, 455*
Matt. x. 34 495, 501*
Matt. x. 35 32, 382
Matt. x. 37 403
Matt. x. 38 214, 234
Matt. x. 42 310, 591

Matt. xi. 1 145, 608
Matt. xi. 3 341
Matt. xi. 5 229, 260
Matt. xi. 7 73, 106*, 318
Matt. xi. 8 227, 442, 591
Matt. xi. 11 59, 244*, 384
Matt. xi. 12 259, 363, 370
Matt. xi. 13 71, 634
Matt. xi. 16 209, 432
Matt. xi. 17 437
Matt. xi. 18 488, 552
Matt. xi. 19 51, 371
Matt. xi. 21 304*
Matt. xi. 23 153
Matt. xi. 24 121
Matt. xi. 25 370, 428, 457, 459, 552, 630
Matt. xi. 26 182
Matt. xi. 27 310, 508
Matt. xi. 29 215

Matt. xii. 1 63, 77, 116, 118, 177, 218
Matt. xii. 2 85, 332, 385
Matt. xii. 3 77, 519
Matt. xii. 4 131, 198
Matt. xii. 7 66, 304*
Matt. xii. 9 146*
Matt. xii. 10 203, 319*, 332, 509*
Matt. xii. 11 169, 202
Matt. xii. 12 63, 301, 444
Matt. xii. 13 72, 528
Matt. xii. 14 288
Matt. xii. 15 147*
Matt. xii. 18 156, 278*
Matt. xii. 19 82, 488

Matt. xii. 20 70, 82
Matt. xii. 21 75, 514
Matt. xii. 23 511
Matt. xii. 24 126
Matt. xii. 25 252, 518
Matt. xii. 26 173*, 279, 292
Matt. xii. 27 441*
Matt. xii. 28 90, 292, 445, 541
Matt. xii. 29 477
Matt. xii. 30 376, 483*
Matt. xii. 32 307, 488*, 499, 595*
Matt. xii. 33 368
Matt. xii. 35 106, 135, 174, 524
Matt. xii. 36 148, 181, 574
Matt. xii. 37 368, 441, 609
Matt. xii. 38 371
Matt. xii. 39 60, 437
Matt. xii. 40 540, 541
Matt. xii. 41 228, 377*, 397*
Matt. xii. 42 67, 121, 376
Matt. xii. 43 431
Matt. xii. 46 274
Matt. xii. 50 112, 150, 160

Matt. xiii. 2 408*
Matt. xiii. 3 106*, 325, 333
Matt. xiii. 4 403*
Matt. xiii. 6 57, 120
Matt. xiii. 13 81
Matt. xiii. 14 61, 82, 211, 354, 466
Matt. xiii. 15 494, 503
Matt. xiii. 16 585
Matt. xiii. 18 185*
Matt. xiii. 19 483
Matt. xiii. 20 377
Matt. xiii. 22 369
Matt. xiii. 23 81
Matt. xiii. 24 524*
Matt. xiii. 25 175, 329*, 385, 398
Matt. xiii. 26 84
Matt. xiii. 27 510, 548
Matt. xiii. 28 285
Matt. xiii. 29 104, 470, 476
Matt. xiii. 30 225
Matt. xiii. 31 607
Matt. xiii. 33 607
Matt. xiii. 34 268*
Matt. xiii. 41 437
Matt. xiii. 44 57, 110, 371
Matt. xiii. 45 523
Matt. xiii. 47 110
Matt. xiii. 48 428
Matt. xiii. 49 75
Matt. xiii. 52 211, 429
Matt. xiii. 53 539, 608
Matt. xiii. 54 539
Matt. xiii. 55 539
Matt. xiii. 56 405, 539
Matt. xiii. 57 539
Matt. xiii. 58 539

Matt. xiv. 1 61, 113, 185
Matt. xiv. 2 123
Matt. xiv. 3 202, 275, 414*
Matt. xiv. 6 218
Matt. xiv. 7 377*
Matt. xiv. 8 558
Matt. xiv. 11 392
Matt. xiv. 13 216
Matt. xiv. 14 233, 141, 147
Matt. xiv. 15 287
Matt. xiv. 19 71, 407, 426, 428
Matt. xiv. 20 528
Matt. xiv. 21 552
Matt. xiv. 22 297, 333*, 429
Matt. xiv. 23 330, 428
Matt. xiv. 24 471*
Matt. xiv. 25 374
Matt. xiv. 26 371
Matt. xiv. 28 330
Matt. xiv. 29 369*
Matt. xiv. 31 201*
Matt. xiv. 33 607
Matt. xiv. 34 121
Matt. xiv. 36 306*

Matt. xv. 2 88, 143, 198, 254, 308*
Matt. xv. 4 316, 339, 466
Matt. xv. 5 127, 506, 600*
Matt. xv. 7 71
Matt. xv. 11 106, 429, 495
Matt. xv. 16 464*
Matt. xv. 17 596*
Matt. xv. 18 429
Matt. xv. 19 520
Matt. xv. 20 548
Matt. xv. 23 173*, 595*
Matt. xv. 26 319, 513
Matt. xv. 27 199, 369*
Matt. xv. 28 549, 592
Matt. xv. 29 403*
Matt. xv. 30 403*
Matt. xv. 32 168*, 233, 409, 502, 563
Matt. xv. 34 548*
Matt. xv. 35 74, 428
Matt. xv. 38 552

Matt. xvi. 6 223, 580
Matt. xvi. 7 598*
Matt. xvi. 9 205
Matt. xvi. 11 580*
Matt. xvi. 13 529*
Matt. xvi. 14 105, 521
Matt. xvi. 16 114
Matt. xvi. 17 549, 552
Matt. xvi. 18 125, 155, 394, 443, 638
Matt. xvi. 19 32, 65, 121
Matt. xvi. 20 334*, 477
Matt. xvi. 21 83, 369, 371, 422
Matt. xvi. 22 211*, 280*, 507*
Matt. xvi. 26 87, 131*, 564*
Matt. xvi. 27 564*
Matt. xvi. 28 198, 506, 508

Matt. xvii. 1 428
Matt. xvii. 2 437
Matt. xvii. 3 433
Matt. xvii. 4 66, 173, 292, 319
Matt. xvii. 5 71, 199, 278*, 431
Matt. xvii. 6 74, 125, 174
Matt. xvii. 9 123, 366
Matt. xvii. 11 265*
Matt. xvii. 12 218*, 369
Matt. xvii. 14 210
Matt. xvii. 15 155
Matt. xvii. 16 84
Matt. xvii. 17 83, 202
Matt. xvii. 18 142*
Matt. xvii. 19 152, 457
Matt. xvii. 20 247*, 471
Matt. xvii. 24 85
Matt. xvii. 25 420, 129, 370*, 540
Matt. xvii. 27 364, 561

Matt. xviii. 1 244, 445
Matt. xviii. 3 469*, 506
Matt. xviii. 4 45, 257, 308
Matt. xviii. 5 393*
Matt. xviii. 6 337*, 611*
Matt. xviii. 7 371
Matt. xviii. 8 241, 320, 518
Matt. xviii. 9 177
Matt. xviii. 11 178
Matt. xviii. 12 211
Matt. xviii. 13 232, 293
Matt. xviii 14 117
Matt. xviii. 15 82, 87
Matt. xviii. 16 375, 440
Matt xviii. 17 106, 293
Matt. xviii. 19 163
Matt. xviii. 21 82, 233, 355
Matt. xviii. 22 250*
Matt. xviii. 23 330, 376, 523
Matt. xviii. 24 117*
Matt. xviii. 25 301, 484*
Matt. xviii. 27 204, 221
Matt. xviii. 28 117, 202, 209
Matt. xviii. 29 545
Matt. xviii. 31 455
Matt. xviii. 32 183, 549
Matt. xviii. 33 440

Matt. xix. 1 608
Matt. xix. 2 147*
Matt. xix. 3 116, 331, 402*, 509
Matt. xix. 5 183, 262, 522*
Matt. xix. 6 301
Matt. xix. 8 124, 405*
Matt. xix. 9 394
Matt. xix. 10 292, 319, 465
Matt. xix. 11 158, 171
Matt. xix. 12 122
Matt. xix. 13 270, 288*
Matt. xix. 17 292
Matt. xix. 18 87, 109, 502
Matt. xix. 19 316
Matt. xix. 21 607
Matt. xix. 22 343, 349*
Matt. xix. 24 319
Matt. xix. 25 445
Matt. xix. 26 395
Matt. xix. 28 408, 409
Matt. xix. 29 43, 200

Matt. xx. 1 213*, 254, 523
Matt. xx. 2 368*, 376, 433
Matt. xx. 3 124, 384, 406
Matt. xx. 8 621
Matt. xx. 9 398
Matt. xx. 10 321, 437*
Matt. xx. 12 209
Matt. xx. 13 206
Matt. xx. 15 509
Matt. xx. 18 210
Matt. xx. 19 88, 218
Matt. xx. 20 170*, 227
Matt. xx. 21 122, 125, 173, 367, 552
Matt. xx. 22 32, 168
Matt. xx. 23 451, 582
Matt. xx. 24 64, 232
Matt. xx. 25 613
Matt. xx. 28 318, 364, 383
Matt. xx. 29 67

Matt. xx. 30 87, 251, 404
Matt. xx. 31 549

Matt. xxi. 1 182, 396
Matt. xxi. 2 155*
Matt. xxi. 3 453*
Matt. xxi. 4 563, 564*
Matt. xxi. 5 85, 155, 156*, 430, 437
Matt. xxi. 6 564
Matt. xxi. 7 143, 175*
Matt. xxi. 8 270, 417, 515
Matt. xxi. 9 551, 585
Matt. xxi. 11 370
Matt. xxi. 13 31, 267, 615
Matt. xxi. 19 117*, 375*, 508
Matt. xxi. 20 276*
Matt. xxi. 21 261
Matt. xxi. 22 307*
Matt. xxi. 23 220, 441
Matt. xxi. 24 173, 227
Matt. xxi. 31 64, 169
Matt. xxi. 33 71, 523
Matt. xxi. 35 105
Matt. xxi. 36 244
Matt. xxi. 37 221
Matt. xxi. 40 308*
Matt. xxi. 41 83, 144*, 637*
Matt. xxi. 42 164, 238, 365*, 385

Matt. xxii. 1 602
Matt. xxii. 2 176
Matt. xxii. 3 56
Matt. xxii. 4 126
Matt. xxii. 5 154, 528
Matt. xxii. 10 201
Matt. xxii. 12 483
Matt. xxii. 13 552
Matt. xxii. 16 95, 206, 424, 463, 499
Matt. xxii. 17 333, 509
Matt. xxii. 22 74
Matt. xxii. 23 267
Matt. xxii. 24 482
Matt. xxii. 25 84, 342, 475*
Matt. xxii. 28 195, 385, 446
Matt. xxii. 29 489
Matt. xxii. 30 488
Matt. xxii. 33 232
Matt. xxii. 36 246*
Matt. xxii. 37 143
Matt. xxii. 39 151
Matt. xxii. 40 64
Matt. xxii. 42 113
Matt. xxii. 43 228
Matt. xxii. 44 81

Matt. xxiii. 4 78, 430
Matt. xxiii. 5 452*, 456
Matt. xxiii. 8 155
Matt. xxiii. 9 488, 590*
Matt. xxiii. 10 488
Matt. xxiii. 12 253, 280*, 543
Matt. xxiii. 15 552, 592*
Matt. xxiii. 20 88
Matt. xxiii. 23 66, 520
Matt. xxiii. 25 201*
Matt. xxiii. 27 63, 209
Matt. xxiii. 30 80, 304, 523
Matt. xxiii. 31 151, 212*, 301
Matt. xxiii. 32 311*, 437*
Matt. xxiii. 33 223*, 285
Matt. xxiii. 34 64, 84, 419, 459, 594*, 598
Matt. xxiii. 35 61, 129, 459, 462, 587
Matt. xxiii. 36 548
Matt. xxiii. 37 230, 330
Matt. xxiii. 39 456, 506, 551

Matt. xxiv. 1 429
Matt. xxiv. 2 300, 409, 481*,
Matt. xxiv. 4 504
Matt. xxiv. 6 185*, 501*
Matt. xxiv. 7 41, 401
Matt. xxiv. 9 213, 348
Matt. xxiv. 10 173
Matt. xxiv. 12 110
Matt. xxiv. 13 160
Matt. xxiv. 15 79, 563
Matt. xxiv. 16 407, 412
Matt. xxiv. 17 362, 368, 501, 502, 629*
Matt. xxiv. 18 417, 502
Matt. xxiv. 20 207, 489
Matt. xxiv. 21 123, 499, 505
Matt. xxiv. 22 363, 171, 234, 477
Matt. xxiv. 24 65, 333, 585
Matt. xxiv. 26 175
Matt. xxiv. 27 176
Matt. xxiv. 30 374
Matt. xxiv. 31 247, 377
Matt. xxiv. 32 90
Matt. xxiv. 33 123, 176, 392, 548
Matt. xxiv. 34 508
Matt. xxiv. 35 506, 552
Matt. xxiv. 38 164*
Matt. xxiv. 40 116, 173, 266*, 384
Matt. xxiv. 41 95
Matt. xxiv. 44 57, 165
Matt. xxiv. 45 325, 524

Matt. xxiv. 46 551
Matt. xxiv. 50 422

Matt. xxv. 1 279
Matt. xxv. 6 207
Matt. xxv. 9 209, 504*, 582, 598*
Matt. xxv. 11 610
Matt. xxv. 13 489
Matt. xxv. 14 154, 599
Matt. xxv. 15 154, 401
Matt. xxv. 16 72
Matt. xxv. 19 433
Matt. xxv. 20 87, 393*
Matt. xxv. 21 409, 524
Matt. xxv. 23 30
Matt. xxv. 24 159*
Matt. xxv. 26 549
Matt. xxv. 27 282*, 303
Matt. xxv. 29 483
Matt. xxv. 32 75, 427
Matt. xxv. 33 122, 552
Matt. xxv. 34 189*, 370
Matt. xxv. 35 77, 80, 84
Matt. xxv. 36 73, 74
Matt. xxv. 37 261
Matt. xxv. 40 409
Matt. xxv. 41 122
Matt. xxv. 45 261, 409

Matt. xxvi. 1 608
Matt. xxvi. 2 265*, 329
Matt. xxvi. 4 66
Matt. xxvi. 5 582, 596*
Matt. xxvi. 8 397
Matt. xxvi. 9 70, 206, 282
Matt. xxvi. 10 72, 397
Matt. xxvi. 11 446
Matt. xxvi. 12 376*
Matt. xxvi. 15 176
Matt. xxvi. 16 422
Matt. xxvi. 17 66, 218, 285
Matt. xxvi. 18 75
Matt. xxvi. 23 414*, 429*
Matt. xxvi. 24 282*, 305, 379*
Matt. xxvi. 25 85
Matt. xxvi. 26 106, 114, 116, 403
Matt. xxvi. 28 114, 132, 191, 341, 411
Matt. xxvi. 29 422
Matt. xxvi. 32 329*
Matt. xxvi. 33 292*, 582
Matt. xxvi. 34 330
Matt xxvi. 35 506, 571
Matt. xxvi. 36 472
Matt. xxvi. 37 177
Matt. xxvi. 38 122, 156
Matt. xxvi. 39 73, 74, 125
Matt. xxvi. 40 267, 330
Matt. xxvi. 42 477
Matt. xxvi. 43 83
Matt. xxvi. 44 71, 424*
Matt. xxvi. 45 311*
Matt. xxvi. 48 275*
Matt. xxvi. 50 167*, 275, 409
Matt. xxvi. 51 607
Matt. xxvi. 53 436, 596
Matt. xxvi. 54 285*
Matt. xxvi. 55 74
Matt. xxvi. 58 603
Matt. xxvi. 59 270, 438*
Matt. xxvi. 60 437
Matt. xxvi. 62 432, 608*
Matt. xxvi. 63 298, 382
Matt. xxvi. 65 257
Matt. xxvi. 66 202
Matt. xxvi. 67 74, 105*, 125, 430
Matt. xxvi. 69 66
Matt. xxvi. 71 147, 178*
Matt. xxvi. 72 545
Matt. xxvi. 73 235
Matt. xxvi. 74 88, 457*

Matt. xxvii. 1 318, 382
Matt. xxvii. 2 138
Matt. xxvii. 4 47, 76
Matt. xxvii. 5 253*, 385, 414*
Matt. xxvii. 7 206, 211*, 368*
Matt. xxvii. 8 590
Matt. xxvii. 9 61
Matt. xxvii. 12 261
Matt. xxvii. 13 432
Matt. xxvii. 14 173*
Matt. xxvii. 15 401*
Matt. xxvii. 18 268, 399*
Matt. xxvii. 21 582
Matt. xxvii. 22 143, 222, 444, 455*
Matt. xxvii. 23 447*
Matt. xxvii. 24 47, 113, 197
Matt. xxvii. 25 587
Matt. xxvii. 28 226
Matt. xxvii. 29 182, 366, 408, 592
Matt. xxvii. 30 430
Matt. xxvii. 31 88, 226
Matt. xxvii. 32 182
Matt. xxvii. 33 166
Matt. xxvii. 34 319, 330, 376
Matt. xxvii. 35 257

Matt. xxvii. 37 275*, 340
Matt. xxvii. 38 122, 173
Matt. xxvii. 39 222, 268
Matt. xxvii. 40 79, 135, 292, 353*
Matt. xxvii. 41 571
Matt. xxvii. 43 214, 233, 409
Matt. xxvii. 44 175*, 227
Matt. xxvii. 45 43, 111, 124, 407
Matt. xxvii. 46 63, 169
Matt. xxvii. 47 79, 559
Matt. xxvii. 48 607
Matt. xxvii. 50 164, 226
Matt. xxvii. 51 603
Matt. xxvii. 52 514
Matt. xxvii. 54 270*
Matt. xxvii. 55 275
Matt. xxvii. 56 66, 190
Matt. xxvii. 57 370
Matt. xxvii. 58 113
Matt. xxvii. 60 427
Matt. xxvii. 62 113
Matt. xxvii. 63 403
Matt. xxvii. 64 123
Matt. xxvii. 66 377

Matt. xxviii. 1 203, 248, 471
Matt. xxviii. 2 344
Matt. xxviii. 3 247
Matt. xxviii. 5 135
Matt. xxviii. 7 123, 276
Matt. xxviii. 8 377
Matt. xxviii. 9 296
Matt. xxviii. 12 176
Matt. xxviii. 14 293, 375

Matt. xxviii. 16 396, 471
Matt. xxviii. 17 105*
Matt. xxviii. 18 116
Matt. xxviii. 19 23, 141, 192, 251, 314

Mark i. 1 125, 187
Mark i. 4 188*, 350*
Mark i. 5 438
Mark i. 6 86, 198
Mark i. 7 148, 268, 319
Mark i. 8 150
Mark i. 9 416
Mark i. 10 554*
Mark i. 13 60, 376, 539
Mark i. 14 329
Mark i. 15 213
Mark i. 16 413, 417*
Mark i. 17 606, 608
Mark i. 22 232, 437
Mark i. 24 66, 585, 626
Mark i. 26 164
Mark i. 27 436
Mark i. 29 61
Mark i. 31 268
Mark i. 32 84, 106, 120
Mark i. 34 81, 85, 145
Mark i. 35 46, 71, 608*
Mark i. 38 46, 558
Mark i. 39 416
Mark i. 40 76, 210, 606
Mark i. 41 344
Mark i. 42 427
Mark i. 44 146*, 313, 499
Mark i. 45 86, 392, 480, 524

Mark ii. 1 380*, 413, 415*, 539, 595
Mark ii. 2 405, 480
Mark ii. 4 330, 473
Mark ii. 5 80
Mark ii. 6 349
Mark ii. 8 554*
Mark ii. 9 314
Mark ii. 10 580
Mark ii. 13 86
Mark ii. 14 66, 608
Mark ii. 15 527
Mark ii. 16 128, 457, 585
Mark ii. 18 128, 145, 348*
Mark ii. 19 332, 386
Mark ii. 21 524
Mark ii. 23 116, 256*, 323*, 578*
Mark ii. 24 612*
Mark ii. 25 77, 150
Mark ii. 26 375, 439*
Mark ii. 27 145, 270

Mark iii. 2 299*
Mark iii. 3 234
Mark iii. 5 72, 232, 313, 393
Mark iii. 6 299
Mark iii. 7 396
Mark iii. 8 67
Mark iii. 9 186, 433
Mark iii. 10 426, 430
Mark iii. 11 309*, 433, 514
Mark iii. 13 428
Mark iii. 14 318, 579
Mark iii. 15 579
Mark iii. 16 182, 276*, 564, 579*
Mark iii. 17 132, 564*, 579
Mark iii. 18 564, 579

Mark iii. 19 579
Mark iii. 20 480, 489*
Mark iii. 21 277*, 366*
Mark iii. 22 277
Mark iii. 24 145, 252
Mark iii. 26 272
Mark iii. 27 293
Mark iii. 30 445
Mark iii. 34 406

Mark iv. 1 405*
Mark iv. 3 543
Mark iv. 4 514, 608
Mark iv. 10 227, 270
Mark iv. 12 459, 461*, 494, 503*
Mark iv. 13 279
Mark iv. 19 192*, 369
Mark iv. 21 127, 287, 430, 511
Mark iv. 22 235
Mark iv. 25 446
Mark iv. 28 464, 528
Mark iv. 29 251*
Mark iv. 30 212, 517
Mark iv. 31 133, 242
Mark iv. 32 242
Mark iv. 33 111
Mark iv. 37 251*, 430
Mark iv. 38 150
Mark iv. 39 312, 315*, 538
Mark iv. 41 224

Mark v. 2 147, 220
Mark v. 3 330, 490, 499
Mark v. 4 50, 329, 334
Mark v. 5 349
Mark v. 7 585
Mark v. 9 145
Mark v. 10 334*
Mark v. 11 349, 395
Mark v. 13 514, 562
Mark v. 14 268
Mark v. 15 267
Mark v. 16 298
Mark v. 18 270, 336
Mark v. 19 221
Mark v. 21 407
Mark v. 23 87, 289, 315
Mark v. 25 184*, 344
Mark v. 26 344, 366*, 486, 629
Mark v. 27 344
Mark v. 29 259
Mark v. 30 155, 201, 413, 414*, 554*
Mark v. 33 110, 433
Mark v. 34 79
Mark v. 37 499
Mark v. 39 495*
Mark v. 40 159
Mark v. 41 141, 182
Mark v. 42 196, 446, 456, 477
Mark v. 43 477
Mark vi. 1 267
Mark vi. 2 344, 607
Mark vi. 3 114, 126
Mark vi. 4 420
Mark vi. 5 70, 143
Mark vi. 6 232
Mark vi. 7 249*
Mark vi. 8 316, 545, 578*
Mark vi. 9 579
Mark vi. 11 313
Mark vi. 13 227
Mark vi. 14 123
Mark vi. 16 123, 164, 628
Mark vi. 17 84, 118
Mark vi. 19 70, 330, 593*
Mark vi. 21 128, 218
Mark vi. 23 64

Mark vi. 25 336*, 592
Mark vi. 31 71
Mark vi. 32 216
Mark vi. 34 233
Mark vi. 36 168*
Mark vi. 37 152*
Mark vi. 39 229*, 249, 392, 464*
Mark vi. 40 74, 249, 398, 401, 464*
Mark vi. 41 145
Mark vi. 45 298
Mark vi. 46 141
Mark vi. 47 123
Mark vi. 48 330, 406*
Mark vi. 52 392
Mark vi. 56 201, 306*, 584*

Mark vii. 2 530, 562
Mark vii. 3 253, 254, 562
Mark vii. 4 121, 319*, 621*
Mark vii. 6 71
Mark vii. 11 563, 600*
Mark vii. 12 499
Mark vii. 13 163
Mark vii. 14 199
Mark vii. 15 91, 114, 160, 429
Mark vii. 17 270
Mark vii. 18 91, 596*
Mark vii. 19 532, 533*, 624

Mark vii. 20 160
Mark vii. 24 437, 608
Mark vii. 25 148, 432, 602
Mark vii. 26 95, 230, 336, 562
Mark vii. 27 330
Mark vii. 28 514
Mark vii. 31 398
Mark vii. 32 430
Mark vii. 34 428
Mark vii. 35 270, 622
Mark vii. 36 150, 240, 603
Mark vii. 37 118

Mark viii. 1 526
Mark viii. 2 233, 409, 563
Mark viii. 3 87, 125
Mark viii. 4 374, 529, 605
Mark viii. 6 288*, 344, 428
Mark viii. 7 548*
Mark viii. 8 529*
Mark viii. 11 342, 365
Mark viii. 12 500*
Mark viii. 15 223, 313
Mark viii. 17 108, 174, 528
Mark viii. 19 213*
Mark viii. 22 149*, 336
Mark viii. 23 509
Mark viii. 26 489*
Mark viii. 27 187*
Mark viii. 29 114
Mark viii. 31 370
Mark viii. 34 168
Mark viii. 35 83
Mark viii. 38 221, 308

Mark ix. 1 79
Mark ix. 2 116, 267
Mark ix. 3 75, 350*
Mark ix. 4 348
Mark ix. 5 66
Mark ix. 6 299
Mark ix. 7 114, 313, 431
Mark ix. 8 451*, 499
Mark ix. 9 123, 297, 301, 367
Mark ix. 10 123
Mark ix. 11 167*, 457*
Mark ix. 12 78, 409, 462*
Mark ix. 13 218, 540
Mark ix. 15 515, 516, 554*
Mark ix. 17 278*
Mark ix. 18 307, 437
Mark ix. 19 83, 549
Mark ix. 20 568*, 632
Mark ix. 22 76, 233, 313, 442
Mark ix. 23 109
Mark ix. 24 155
Mark ix. 25 142, 182
Mark ix. 26 526
Mark ix. 27 149, 202
Mark ix. 28 143, 147, 149, 457
Mark ix. 30 336*
Mark ix. 34 244

Mark ix. 37 111*, 497
Mark ix. 39 313
Mark ix. 40 382, 383
Mark ix. 41 144, 226, 506
Mark ix. 42 243, 432
Mark ix. 43 241, 313
Mark ix. 45 241
Mark ix. 47 320
Mark ix. 50 390*

Mark x. 2 116, 118, 342
Mark x. 6 124
Mark x. 7 432*
Mark x. 10 415*
Mark x. 12 84
Mark x. 13 270, 288, 522*

Mark x. 16 143
Mark x. 17 210, 270, 348
Mark x. 19 501
Mark x. 21 313, 430, 470*
Mark x. 24 214, 233
Mark x. 26 437
Mark x. 27 430
Mark x. 29 420
Mark x. 30 377*, 500

Mark x. 32 348*, 428
Mark x. 34 430
Mark x. 35 518
Mark x. 37 122, 173, 337
Mark x. 38 84, 225, 229
Mark x. 40 271, 552
Mark x. 41 232, 521
Mark x 42 206, 613*
Mark x. 46 118
Mark x. 47 113

Mark xi. 1 296
Mark xi. 4 118
Mark xi. 5 79, 609*
Mark xi. 6 85
Mark xi. 7 430

Mark xi. 8 396, 417
Mark xi. 9 128
Mark xi. 10 113
Mark xi. 12 77
Mark xi. 13 300*, 445, 596*
Mark xi. 14 476, 499, 501*
Mark xi. 15 267
Mark xi. 16 81
Mark xi. 17 267, 276
Mark xi. 18 128, 232, 270, 299
Mark xi. 20 424*
Mark xi. 21 271, 276
Mark xi. 22 186
Mark xi. 23 261, 561
Mark xi. 24 306
Mark xi. 25 309*
Mark xi. 27 128, 207
Mark xi. 28 438
Mark xi. 29 437
Mark xi. 31 579
Mark xi. 32 545, 579*, 626
Mark xi. 33 84

Mark xii. 2 456, 199, 288, 365*
Mark xii. 4 468
Mark xii. 5 105, 583*
Mark xii. 7 85, 114, 195
Mark xii. 11 238
Mark xii. 12 330, 437, 561*
Mark xii. 13 128
Mark xii. 14 285*, 474*, 509
Mark xii. 16 85
Mark xii. 17 232, 393
Mark xii. 18 267
Mark xii. 19 289
Mark xii. 20 475
Mark xii. 23 605*
Mark xii. 24 161*
Mark xii. 25 121, 123
Mark xii. 26 63, 376*, 585
Mark xii. 28 178*, 248

Mark xii. 30 143, 368
Mark xii. 31 239
Mark xii. 32 85, 425*
Mark xii. 33 118, 127, 420
Mark xii. 34 499, 626
Mark xii. 36 81
Mark xii. 38 183, 223, 384, 468*, 577
Mark xii. 39 183
Mark xii. 40 160, 183*, 532, 564, 579
Mark xii. 41 268
Mark xii. 44 528

Mark xiii. 1 117, 526
Mark xiii. 2 409, 506
Mark xiii. 3 415
Mark xiii. 4 85
Mark xiii. 7 501
Mark xiii. 9 152, 163, 375, 416*
Mark xiii. 10 213
Mark xiii. 11 114, 299, 313, 501
Mark xiii. 14 79, 396*, 412, 541
Mark xiii. 15 431, 488, 502
Mark xiii. 16 415, 417
Mark xiii. 17 128
Mark xiii. 19 124, 148, 506
Mark xiii. 20 107, 304*
Mark xiii. 22 333
Mark xiii. 23 152
Mark xiii. 25 133, 348
Mark xiii. 27 121, 125
Mark xiii. 28 90, 313
Mark xiii. 29 123, 605
Mark xiii. 30 506
Mark xiii. 32 129, 373
Mark xiii. 33 84
Mark xiii. 34 462

Mark xiv. 1 299, 388, 424
Mark xiv. 2 456, 503, 596*
Mark xiv. 3 97*, 188, 381*, 544
Mark xiv. 4 349*
Mark xiv. 5 70, 206, 250
Mark xiv. 6 72, 218, 524
Mark xiv. 7 222
Mark xiv. 8 467*
Mark xiv. 9 307
Mark xiv. 11 331
Mark xiv. 12 269, 285, 296
Mark xiv. 13 83, 188

Mark xiv. 15 313, 525
Mark xiv. 19 249
Mark xiv. 20 429
Mark xiv. 21 320, 545
Mark xiv. 22 57, 116, 345
Mark xiv. 24 411
Mark xiv. 25 468
Mark xiv. 27 57
Mark xiv. 29 152, 582*
Mark xiv. 31 331, 506
Mark xiv. 32 297*
Mark xiv. 33 118
Mark xiv. 35 376*, 432
Mark xiv. 36 58, 168, 432, 442, 584
Mark xiv. 37 549

Mark xiv. 38 313
Mark xiv. 40 83, 299
Mark xiv. 43 128, 365*
Mark xiv. 44 72, 275, 313
Mark xiv. 46 275
Mark xiv. 47 96, 117, 118, 253, 254
Mark xiv. 49 317*, 620
Mark xiv. 51 118
Mark xiv. 52 223
Mark xiv. 53 215*
Mark xiv. 54 348, 433
Mark xiv. 55 71, 270
Mark xiv. 58 345
Mark xiv. 60 118, 123, 511
Mark xiv. 61 261
Mark xiv. 64 199
Mark xiv. 65 430
Mark xiv. 67 80, 145
Mark xiv. 68 490
Mark xiv. 69 79
Mark xiv. 71 88
Mark xiv. 72 205

Mark xv. 1 113, 128*
Mark xv. 2 114
Mark xv. 3 203
Mark xv. 4 499
Mark xv. 5 499
Mark xv. 6 269
Mark xv. 7 73
Mark xv. 8 584*
Mark xv. 10 72
Mark xv. 12 165, 222
Mark xv. 13 144
Mark xv. 14 113
Mark xv. 15 113
Mark xv. 16 166*
Mark xv. 17 78, 226
Mark xv. 19 430
Mark xv. 21 121*
Mark xv. 24 408*, 628
Mark xv. 25 57, 124, 126, 436*, 539
Mark xv. 30 79, 313
Mark xv. 31 331, 571
Mark xv. 33 126
Mark xv. 34 226
Mark xv. 38 603
Mark xv. 39 591*
Mark xv. 40 190, 603
Mark xv. 41 140
Mark xv. 43 113, 348
Mark xv. 44 272*, 298, 542
Mark xv. 45 113, 365, 371
Mark xv. 46 426, 427
Mark xv. 47 190, 268

Mark xvi. 1 113, 190, 276
Mark xvi. 2 248, 343*
Mark xvi. 3 362*, 364*, 366, 561
Mark xvi. 4 271, 446
Mark xvi. 5 345*
Mark xvi. 6 538
Mark xvi. 7 438, 521
Mark xvi. 8 452*
Mark xvi. 9 73
Mark xvi. 11 259
Mark xvi. 12 121
Mark xvi. 15 124, 314
Mark xvi. 17 524
Mark xvi. 18 506
Mark xvi. 19 428

Luke i. 1 276*, 448*, 541, 545, 613*
Luke i. 2 545
Luke i. 3 545
Luke i. 4 165, 288
Luke i. 5 125
Luke i. 6 127
Luke i. 8 329, 608
Luke i. 9 50, 200*, 319, 321, 324, 353*
Luke i. 12 430
Luke i. 13 182
Luke i. 14 90, 211, 232
Luke i. 15 68, 506
Luke i. 17 318, 61, 146, 432
Luke i. 18 152
Luke i. 20 164, 349, 364*, 486*, 610
Luke i. 21 232*, 515
Luke i. 22 70, 150*
Luke i. 23 296, 540
Luke i. 24 88
Luke i. 25 57, 422, 445
Luke i. 26 219
Luke i. 27 73
Luke i. 28 585
Luke i. 29 161, 299
Luke i. 30 365*
Luke i. 31 593*, 607*
Luke i. 32 113
Luke i. 33 206, 409
Luke i. 34 480
Luke i. 35 178, 430
Luke i. 36 64, 69, 110
Luke i. 37 171, 173*, 280*, 395
Luke i. 38 427
Luke i. 39 591, 608

Luke i. 40 61
Luke i. 41 608
Luke i. 42 246*, 551
Luke i. 43 337*, 338
Luke i. 44 386
Luke i. 45 585
Luke i. 46 639
Luke i. 47 393, 639
Luke i. 48 75, 430
Luke i. 51 125, 277*, 388
Luke i. 53 201, 228
Luke i. 54 202
Luke i. 55 562, 577*
Luke i. 57 324
Luke i. 58 128
Luke i. 59 228, 269*, 394*, 410
Luke i. 62 109, 308*
Luke i. 64 72, 622*
Luke i. 66 174
Luke i. 67 71
Luke i. 68 469*, 551
Luke i. 70 132, 562, 606
Luke i. 72 164, 205, 376
Luke i. 73 164, 225, 226, 326*, 577, 628*
Luke i. 74 197, 627
Luke i. 75 230, 321, 386
Luke i. 76 152, 432, 607, 615
Luke i. 78 611
Luke i. 79 89, 431

Luke ii. 1 254*, 319, 365, 429, 534, 608
Luke ii. 2 244*
Luke ii. 4 125, 329, 330, 364*
Luke ii. 5 73
Luke ii. 7 211*, 385
Luke ii. 8 225, 349, 409
Luke ii. 10 208
Luke ii. 11 125
Luke ii. 12 118, 345*
Luke ii. 13 68, 526
Luke ii. 14 120
Luke ii. 15 427
Luke ii. 16 74, 113, 439
Luke ii. 17 132
Luke ii. 18 232
Luke ii. 20 57, 163
Luke ii. 21 324, 329, 438*, 605*
Luke ii. 22 147*, 325, 401, 428
Luke ii. 23 123, 562
Luke ii. 24 123, 325
Luke ii. 25 585
Luke ii. 26 122, 297, 481
Luke ii. 27 64, 325
Luke ii. 28 150*
Luke ii. 30 607
Luke ii. 31 174, 400
Luke ii. 33 519
Luke ii. 34 184*, 397
Luke ii. 35 310, 366, 462*
Luke ii. 36 41, 138, 149, 604*
Luke ii. 37 427, 593
Luke ii. 39 275
Luke ii. 41 68, 215*, 230, 531
Luke ii. 42 196
Luke ii. 44 188*, 226*, 231
Luke ii. 45 342, 344*, 484
Luke ii. 46 199
Luke ii. 48 276, 518

Luke iii. 1 61, 126, 138*, 219
Luke iii. 2 41, 60, 122, 375
Luke iii. 5 591
Luke iii. 7 270
Luke iii. 8 614
Luke iii. 10 279
Luke iii. 11 482
Luke iii. 13 105, 240, 404
Luke iii. 14 232
Luke iii. 15 299
Luke iii. 16 261, 412*
Luke iii. 18 223, 525*
Luke iii. 19 61, 144
Luke iii. 20 393
Luke iii. 21 72, 323
Luke iii. 22 132, 232
Luke iii. 23 196, 349*
Luke iii. 27 60
Luke iii. 29 52, 66
Luke iii. 30 67
Luke iii. 32 67
Luke iii. 37 52
Luke iv. 2 77, 499, 544
Luke iv. 3 336
Luke iv. 6 271*
Luke iv. 7 214, 291
Luke iv. 8 210
Luke iv. 9 118
Luke iv. 10 326
Luke iv. 12 316
Luke iv. 14 382
Luke iv. 15 145, 150, 353*
Luke iv. 16 177, 211, 217
Luke iv. 18 43, 223, 272*
Luke iv. 20 106
Luke iv. 22 212, 237
Luke iv. 23 347, 416*, 529

Lnke iv. 25 61, 63, 296, 408*
Luke iv. 26 187, 508
Luke iv. 27 375
Luke iv. 29 71, 118, 329, 374, 603
Luke iv. 30 378
Luke iv. 31 348
Luke iv. 32 232
Luke iv. 34 234, 626
Luke iv. 35 50, 123, 227, 344*, 483*, 544
Luke iv. 36 386, 584
Luke iv. 38 621
Luke iv. 40 84, 120, 544
Luke iv. 41 346, 514
Luke iv. 42 325, 471, 604

Luke v. 1 199, 348, 404, 608
Luke v. 2 404, 427
Luke v. 3 335, 366*
Luke v. 4 397*, 541, 580*
Luke v. 5 394*
Luke v. 7 325
Luke v. 8 549
Luke v. 9 163, 544
Luke v. 10 209, 211, 348, 571
Luke v. 12 122, 198, 545, 608
Luke v. 14 146*, 481, 545, 579, 598
Luke v. 15 268, 371, 411
Luke v. 16 150, 413, 414*
Luke v. 17 146*, 147, 150, 436
Luke v. 19 207*, 428, 590
Luke v. 20 80
Luke v. 21 465
Luke v. 23 80
Luke v. 24 580
Luke v. 25 158, 408*
Luke v. 27 182
Luke v. 29 66
Luke v. 30 376
Luke v. 32 271*
Luke v. 33 85
Luke v. 36 430, 523
Luke v. 37 150

Luke vi. 1 100*, 116, 323, 431
Luke vi. 2 559
Luke vi. 3 296, 519
Luke vi. 6 323
Luke vi. 7 253, 288
Luke vi. 8 123
Luke vi. 10 72
Luke vi. 11 76, 303, 308*
Luke vi. 12 185, 348
Luke vi. 13 370, 432*
Luke vi. 16 131, 190
Luke vi. 17 141, 259
Luke vi. 18 371*
Luke vi. 19 268, 330, 515
Luke vi. 20 143, 396, 607
Luke vi. 21 84
Luke vi. 23 121, 268, 558
Luke vi. 25 87
Luke vi. 27 222
Luke vi. 29 501
Luke vi. 30 592*
Luke vi. 31 540
Luke vi. 34 295, 331, 428
Luke vi. 35 45, 118, 409, 477
Luke vi. 37 506
Luke vi. 38 112, 412, 525
Luke vi. 39 511
Luke vi. 42 150, 366*, 485
Luke vi. 44 111, 412, 488
Luke vi. 47 111, 155
Luke vi. 48 73, 225, 330, 469*, 603
Luke vi. 49 483

Luke vii. 1 275
Luke vii. 3 338
Luke vii. 4 76
Luke vii. 5 150*
Luke vii. 6 61
Luke vii. 7 442, 595
Luke vii. 8 349*
Luke vii. 9 490, 493
Luke vii. 11 590
Luke vii. 12 211*, 296, 438*, 605
Luke vii. 13 233

Luke vii. 17 413, 414*
Luke vii. 18 548
Luke vii. 19 341, 594
Luke vii. 20 271
Luke vii. 21 323
Luke vii. 22 123, 260
Luke vii. 25 227
Luke vii. 29 110, 564*
Luke vii. 30 213*, 484
Luke vii. 31 564
Luke vii. 33 86, 483*
Luke vii. 34 51, 86, 552
Luke vii. 36 117, 270, 336
Luke vii. 37 268, 344, 544
Luke vii. 39 304*, 541
Luke vii. 42 169, 240
Luke vii. 43 582
Luke vii. 44 110

Luke vii. 45 345, 592
Luke vii. 47 80, 132, 456*
Luke vii. 50 143, 271

Luke viii. 2 514
Luke viii. 3 138, 340, 366
Luke viii. 5 105, 225, 333, 576
Luke viii. 6 90, 482
Luke viii. 7 90, 123
Luke viii. 8 90, 132, 319
Luke viii. 9 270, 299
Luke viii. 12 287
Luke viii. 13 405*
Luke viii. 14 369
Luke viii. 15 524
Luke viii. 16 376
Luke viii. 17 300, 307*, 481
Luke viii. 18 306, 480*, 613*
Luke viii. 19 70
Luke viii. 20 588*
Luke viii. 21 105
Luke viii. 22 285, 519
Luke viii. 23 270
Luke viii. 24 128, 610
Luke viii. 25 445
Luke viii. 28 198, 585
Luke viii. 29 63, 218*
Luke viii. 30 514
Luke viii. 31 336
Luke viii. 32 311, 634
Luke viii. 34 416*
Luke viii. 37 515
Luke viii. 38 514
Luke viii. 39 400
Luke viii. 40 259
Luke viii. 41 268, 270
Luke viii. 43 213, 386, 499
Luke viii. 46 346
Luke viii. 47 301
Luke viii. 48 549
Luke viii. 51 499
Luke viii. 52 222, 268
Luke viii. 53 268
Luke viii. 54 182, 183, 202

Luke ix. 1 577
Luke ix. 3 316*, 398, 488, 489
Luke ix. 4 314
Luke ix. 5 480
Luke ix. 6 400
Luke ix. 7 61, 123
Luke ix. 9 153*
Luke ix. 12 251*, 515
Luke ix. 13 116, 239, 294*, 516*
Luke ix. 14 229*, 464
Luke ix. 16 106, 116, 340, 344, 428
Luke ix. 19 105*, 138
Luke ix. 20 549
Luke ix. 22 83, 371*
Luke ix. 25 87, 253
Luke ix. 26 543
Luke ix. 27 198*, 308, 506
Luke ix. 28 58, 116, 516*, 563
Luke ix. 31 70
Luke ix. 32 83, 340
Luke ix. 33 66, 319
Luke ix. 34 431*
Luke ix. 36 76, 158, 385
Luke ix. 37 367, 523
Luke ix. 39 427
Luke ix. 40 70, 336
Luke ix. 41 83
Luke ix. 42 544
Luke ix. 45 370, 459*
Luke ix. 46 244, 308, 413
Luke ix. 47 202, 395
Luke ix. 49 393*
Luke ix. 50 168
Luke ix. 51 150, 608
Luke ix. 52 318, 594*, 607
Luke ix. 54 285*, 431, 595
Luke ix. 57 307
Luke ix. 61 362, 629
Luke ix. 62 213, 430

Luke x. 1 70, 150, 249, 398, 472*, 527,
Luke x. 2 270, 338, 559
Luke x. 4 43, 493, 501
Luke x. 6 428, 429, 583
Luke x. 7 86, 106, 366*
Luke x. 8 306, 310, 579*
Luke x. 9 407*
Luke x. 11 253
Luke x. 13 516*
Luke x. 18 269
Luke x. 19 274*, 499, 507
Luke x. 20 232, 387*, 495*, 497
Luke x. 21 126, 209
Luke x. 23 153
Luke x. 24 153*, 330
Luke x. 28 436
Luke x. 29 130*, 437
Luke x. 30 67, 344, 432, 543
Luke x. 32 400, 571
Luke x. 34 205, 428
Luke x. 35 46, 143, 307

Luke x. 36 130*, 396, 430
Luke x. 37 376, 456
Luke x. 40 85, 336, 406, 432
Luke x. 41 610
Luke x. 42 246*, 427, 456

Luke xi. 1 117, 440
Luke xi. 2 309
Luke xi. 3 97*
Luke xi. 4 111
Luke xi. 5 169, 280*, 286
Luke xi. 6 367*
Luke xi. 7 415
Luke xi. 8 363, 45, 200*, 330, 479
Luke xi. 10 111
Luke xi. 11 512, 568*
Luke xi. 12 295*
Luke xi. 13 629*
Luke xi. 17 41, 173
Luke xi. 18 445*
Luke xi. 19 152
Luke xi. 20 292
Luke xi. 22 31, 233
Luke xi. 24 483*
Luke xi. 28 559
Luke xi. 29 189*
Luke xi. 31 67
Luke xi. 33 238*
Luke xi. 34 143
Luke xi. 35 503
Luke xi. 36 308
Luke xi. 37 74, 338
Luke xi. 39 128, 201, 522
Luke xi. 42 128, 251
Luke xi. 44 84
Luke xi. 46 226
Luke xi. 48 445, 457*, 558
Luke xi. 49 396, 589
Luke xi. 50 123, 410, 459
Luke xi. 51 129
Luke xi. 52 65, 74
Luke xi. 53 593*

Luke xii. 1 386*
Luke xii. 2 441*, 481
Luke xii. 3 364*
Luke xii. 4 83, 162*
Luke xii. 5 299, 329, 429
Luke xii. 6 172*, 510
Luke xii. 8 57, 144, 226*, 455*
Luke xii. 9 259
Luke xii. 10 222, 397
Luke xii. 11 128, 299, 407, 427*
Luke xii. 12 133
Luke xii. 13 376
Luke xii. 14 228, 409
Luke xii. 15 223, 367
Luke xii. 16 71, 78, 602
Luke xii. 17 57, 472
Luke xii. 18 155, 472*
Luke xii. 19 396
Luke xii. 20 183, 218, 256*, 522*, 588
Luke xii. 21 397
Luke xii. 24 94
Luke xii. 26 478*, 490
Luke xii. 27 493
Luke xii. 29 437
Luke xii. 30 155, 456, 548*, 549
Luke xii. 32 183
Luke xii. 35 155
Luke xii. 36 176, 367*
Luke xii. 37 607, 608*
Luke xii. 42 410
Luke xii. 44 393, 410
Luke xii. 45 552, 614
Luke xii. 46 422
Luke xii. 47 162, 226, 405, 483*, 589*
Luke xii. 48 164, 229, 522
Luke xii. 49 143*, 448*
Luke xii. 50 297
Luke xii. 51 442*
Luke xii. 53 392*
Luke xii. 54 116*, 265
Luke xii. 58 427, 454, 502
Luke xii. 59 506*

Luke xiii. 1 376, 623*
Luke xiii. 2 240, 271*, 404*, 508
Luke xiii. 4 385*
Luke xiii. 7 169
Luke xiii. 8 297, 406
Luke xiii. 9 296*, 583, 600*
Luke xiii. 11 250, 424*, 486
Luke xiii. 12 183, 271
Luke xiii. 13 73
Luke xiii. 14 58, 218
Luke xiii. 15 129
Luke xiii. 16 197, 218, 250, 563
Luke xiii. 17 429
Luke xiii. 18 456
Luke xiii. 19 125, 514
Luke xiii. 22 256, 400
Luke xiii. 23 509
Luke xiii. 24 563
Luke xiii. 27 110, 427
Luke xiii. 28 75, 88, 309

Luke xiii. 29 60
Luke xiii. 32 590
Luke xiii. 33 590
Luke xiii. 34 83, 152, 330, 407
Luke xiii. 35 296, 298*, 456, 506, 508, 528

Luke xiv. 1 218
Luke xiv. 3 128
Luke xiv. 4 143, 202, 521
Luke xiv. 5 169, 632
Luke xiv. 7 268*, 593, 602
Luke xiv. 8 459, 503
Luke xiv. 10 69, 74, 428, 459*
Luke xiv. 12 488, 497
Luke xiv. 16 69
Luke xiv. 18 276*, 423, 545, 591*
Luke xiv. 19 259, 276*
Luke xiv. 20 84
Luke xiv. 21 128, 520
Luke xiv. 23 127
Luke xiv. 24 198, 482
Luke xiv. 26 126, 479
Luke xiv. 27 480
Luke xiv. 30 333
Luke xiv. 31 41, 384
Luke xiv. 32 465
Luke xiv. 35 213*, 488

Luke xv. 2 426
Luke xv. 4 297, 407
Luke xv. 6 128, 256*
Luke xv. 9 128, 256*
Luke xv. 14 63, 400*
Luke xv. 15 632
Luke xv. 16 198*, 201, 370
Luke xv. 17 201, 558
Luke xv. 18 58, 608*
Luke xv. 19 319, 337, 615
Luke xv. 23 90
Luke xv. 24 87
Luke xv. 25 121, 199
Luke xv. 26 117, 169, 299
Luke xv. 28 270, 330, 456
Luke xv. 29 125*, 230
Luke xv. 30 155

Luke xvi. 2 76, 143, 521, 602, 614, 628*
Luke xvi. 3 227, 346*, 427
Luke xvi. 4 196, 589
Luke xvi. 6 155, 188
Luke xvi. 8 203*, 237, 238, 240, 598*
Luke xvi. 9 367
Luke xvi. 10 59
Luke xvi. 11 549
Luke xvi. 12 550
Luke xvi. 13 64, 173, 332
Luke xvi. 14 134, 343
Luke xvi. 16 422
Luke xvi. 18 122*
Luke xvi. 19 229
Luke xvi. 20 72, 273*
Luke xvi. 21 201
Luke xvi. 22 176, 323
Luke xvi. 23 176*, 344
Luke xvi. 24 201
Luke xvi. 25 76
Luke xvi. 26 109, 287, 393*, 477, 629
Luke xvi. 29 67
Luke xvi. 31 123, 477

Luke xvii. 1 328, 482*
Luke xvii. 2 241*, 337, 432, 632
Luke xvii. 4 82, 203, 233
Luke xvii. 6 304
Luke xvii. 7 74
Luke xvii. 8 88, 89, 168, 297*
Luke xvii. 10 308*
Luke xvii. 11 112, 385
Luke xvii. 12 207
Luke xvii. 15 377
Luke xvii. 16 122
Luke xvii. 17 510
Luke xvii. 18 511*, 616*
Luke xvii. 22 45, 296
Luke xvii. 23 488, 501, 522
Luke xvii. 24 366, 407, 591
Luke xvii. 25 371
Luke xvii. 28 71, 268
Luke xvii. 31 578
Luke xvii. 32 205
Luke xvii. 33 310
Luke xvii. 34 116, 173, 266*

Luke xviii. 1 329*
Luke xviii. 2 116, 221
Luke xviii. 3 621
Luke xviii. 4 444, 479, 595
Luke xviii. 6 237
Luke xviii. 7 207, 212, 393, 494*, 506, „ „ „ 508, 552
Luke xviii. 8 510*
Luke xviii. 9 109, 301
Luke xviii. 10 173
Luke xviii. 11 58, 183, 440
Luke xviii. 12 203, 274*
Luke xviii. 13 330, 430, 500

Luke xviii. 14 241*
Luke xviii. 15 108
Luke xviii. 17 506
Luke xviii. 18 551
Luke xviii. 21 253
Luke xviii. 25 319
Luke xviii. 27 116
Luke xviii. 29 482, 519
Luke xviii. 30 506, 508
Luke xviii 31 211*
Luke xviii. 34 147*, 227
Luke xviii. 35 67, 404
Luke xviii. 36 299
Luke xviii. 39 150
Luke xviii. 40 207

Luke xix. 1 431
Luke xix. 2 149, 150, 160*
Luke xix. 3 70, 268, 371, 626
Luke xix. 4 207, 288, 429, 590, 603, 632*
Luke xix. 5 333
Luke xix. 7 395*
Luke xix. 8 65
Luke xix. 11 468
Luke xix. 13 125
Luke xix. 14 206
Luke xix. 15 152, 275, 628
Luke xix. 16 72
Luke xix. 17 79
Luke xix. 23 303*
Luke xix. 27 206, 330
Luke xix. 28 428
Luke xix. 29 182
Luke xix. 35 155
Luke xix. 36 384
Luke xix. 37 163, 164, 373, 395*, 516, 526
Luke xix. 39 85
Luke xix. 40 87, 279*
Luke xix. 41 222, 408
Luke xix. 42 125, 197, 227, 438, 599*
Luke xix. 43 436
Luke xix. 44 364*
Luke xix. 46 228
Luke xix. 47 550
Luke xix. 48 71, 87, 299, 429

Luke xx. 2 85, 441, 602
Luke xx. 4 420, 509
Luke xx. 7 481
Luke xx. 9 230
Luke xx. 10 124, 199
Luke xx. 11 468*
Luke xx. 12 105, 468
Luke xx. 14 287
Luke xx. 16 500
Luke xx. 19 405
Luke xx. 20 128, 202*, 321
Luke xx. 22 509
Luke xx. 24 313, 582
Luke xx. 25 109
Luke xx. 26 202, 232
Luke xx. 27 532*, 604
Luke xx. 34 92
Luke xx. 35 133, 200, 609*
Luke xx. 36 490*, 491
Luke xx. 37 63
Luke xx. 40 456, 499
Luke xx. 42 81, 112
Luke xx. 43 527, 605
Luke xx. 46 468*
Luke xx. 47 86

Luke xxi. 3 242
Luke xxi. 4 340
Luke xxi. 6 392, 574*
Luke xxi. 8 504
Luke xxi. 11 439, 637
Luke xxi. 12 84
Luke xxi. 14 481
Luke xxi. 16 589
Luke xxi. 18 364, 506
Luke xxi. 19 274*, 313
Luke xxi. 21 147*
Luke xxi. 22 325
Luke xxi. 23 128
Luke xxi. 24 297, 348*
Luke xxi. 25 65, 120, 121, 552
Luke xxi. 26 371, 420*, 430
Luke xxi. 28 614
Luke xxi. 30 372, 594*
Luke xxi. 33 506
Luke xxi. 34 83, 464
Luke xxi. 37 415

Luke xxii. 1 531
Luke xxii. 2 109, 299
Luke xxii. 6 324
Luke xxii. 9 285
Luke xxii. 10 207
Luke xxii. 11 603
Luke xxii. 14 74, 519
Luke xxii. 15 329, 339, 466*
Luke xxii. 16 297, 499, 506, 508
Luke xxii. 18 199
Luke xxii. 19 116, 153*, 382
Luke xxii. 20 403, 411, 513, 634, 635*

Luke xxii. 21 374
Luke xxii. 23 109, 299*, 445, 543
Luke xxii. 24 244, 613*
Luke xxii. 26 587*
Luke xxii. 27 129, 169
Luke xxii. 30 86, 289
Luke xxii. 31 325, 610
Luke xxii. 32 89, 336
Luke xxii. 33 319, 420
Luke xxii. 34 507
Luke xxii. 35 43, 201
Luke xxii. 36 43, 582*
Luke xxii. 37 109, 513
Luke xxii. 40 375*
Luke xxii. 41 71, 230*, 427
Luke xxii. 42 76, 432, 600
Luke xxii. 44 431
Luke xxii. 45 371
Luke xxii. 47 432
Luke xxii. 49 62, 279*, 341, 388, 509
Luke xxii. 50 118
Luke xxii. 51 201
Luke xxii. 52 74, 377, 407
Luke xxii. 53 155, 207
Luke xxii. 57 183
Luke xxii. 58 178*
Luke xxii. 59 463
Luke xxii. 61 430, 602
Luke xxii. 66 275
Luke xxii. 68 506

Luke xxiii. 1 113, 515, 516
Luke xxiii. 2 203, 604
Luke xxiii. 4 128
Luke xxiii. 5 621*
Luke xxiii. 6 113, 298
Luke xxiii. 7 67, 428
Luke xxiii. 8 367*
Luke xxiii. 9 261
Luke xxiii. 11 428
Luke xxiii. 12 129, 350*, 376, 405, 439, „ „ „ 467, 518
Luke xxiii. 13 113
Luke xxiii. 14 180, 203, 431
Luke xxiii. 15 219
Luke xxiii. 26 121, 430
Luke xxiii. 28 183, 222, 408
Luke xxiii. 31 218, 285, 550
Luke xxiii. 32 530*
Luke xxiii. 33 122, 552
Luke xxiii. 34 168
Luke xxiii. 35 253
Luke xxiii. 38 392
Luke xxiii. 39 175
Luke xxiii. 40 112
Luke xxiii. 41 159, 582*
Luke xxiii. 42 205, 413
Luke xxiii. 44 43, 436*
Luke xxiii. 45 131*
Luke xxiii. 46 125
Luke xxiii. 48 344, 409
Luke xxiii. 50 524, 528
Luke xxiii. 51 146*, 348, 421, 563
Luke xxiii. 53 499
Luke xxiii. 56 276

Luke xxiv. 1 207, 248, 275
Luke xxiv. 2 362, 364*, 369
Luke xxiv. 4 174
Luke xxiv. 5 175, 376
Luke xxiv. 10 131, 190
Luke xxiv. 11 233, 514
Luke xxiv. 13 348, 557
Luke xxiv. 14 212, 268
Luke xxiv. 15 112, 150
Luke xxiv. 16 326
Luke xxiv. 18 57, 103, 112, 630
Luke xxiv. 19 523, 552
Luke xxiv. 20 449
Luke xxiv. 21 114, 254*, 391*, 444, 559, 625
Luke xxiv. 23 484
Luke xxiv. 25 183, 230, 324
Luke xxiv. 27 268, 370, 420, 633*
Luke xxiv. 28 472
Luke xxiv. 29 121, 325, 405*
Luke xxiv. 30 71
Luke xxiv. 31 370
Luke xxiv. 32 268, 348
Luke xxiv. 35 219, 386
Luke xxiv. 36 150
Luke xxiv. 37 350
Luke xxiv. 39 63, 552*
Luke xxiv. 41 371
Luke xxiv. 42 199
Luke xxiv. 46 123, 231*
Luke xxiv. 47 213, 393, 396, 624*
Luke xxiv. 49 297
Luke xxiv. 50 143, 603, 607*
Luke xxiv. 51 428
Luke xxiv. 52 210
Luke xxiv. 53 349

John i. 1 122*, 181, 365, 405, 551
John i. 2 122, 124
John i. 3 173, 379*, 610
John i. 4 114

John i. 5 270
John i. 6 149, 350, 365*, 585
John i. 7 458*
John i. 8 114, 316*, 317*
John i. 9 132, 349*
John i. 10 609
John i. 11 592*
John i. 12 134
John i. 13 177*, 488
John i. 14 122, 193, 201, 564*, 617*, 630
John i. 15 222, 244*, 274
John i. 16 364*, 437*
John i. 17 379*, 639
John i. 18 160, 341, 413, 415*
John i. 19 438*
John i. 20 479, 545, 610
John i. 21 106, 114, 476
John i. 22 620
John i. 25 479*, 488, 491
John i. 26 217, 261, 412*, 537
John i. 27 335, 337
John i. 28 61
John i. 29 266
John i. 30 153, 244*
John i. 31 217, 561
John i. 32 121, 266, 573
John i. 33 408, 412*, 573
John i. 34 273*
John i. 36 430
John i. 38 537
John i. 39 105, 563
John i. 40 230, 268, 298, 537
John i. 41 64
John i. 42 154, 537, 563
John i. 43 60, 153, 430
John i. 44 266, 313, 537, 563
John i. 45 61
John i. 46 133, 267, 537, 543
John i. 47 86, 551
John i. 49 329, 341, 372, 537, 551
John i. 50 114
John i. 51 162, 239
John i. 52 537, 553

John ii. 1 61, 187, 540
John ii. 2 519, 540
John ii. 3 540
John ii. 4 211, 274, 537, 585
John ii. 5 307
John ii. 6 398*, 401, 402, 523
John ii. 7 201, 313, 537, 539
John ii. 8 313, 314, 537, 540
John ii. 9 85, 198, 268, 274, 343, 540
John ii. 10 110, 152, 524
John ii. 11 61, 110
John ii. 12 143, 230, 519
John ii. 13 539
John ii. 14 106, 128, 539
John ii. 15 429, 439, 539, 559
John ii. 16 314, 539
John ii. 17 89, 185
John ii. 18 445*
John ii. 19 312, 385*, 537
John ii. 20 71, 218, 250
John ii. 21 531
John ii. 22 123, 163, 627*
John ii. 23 67, 68, 155, 385, 410, 638
John ii. 24 143, 638
John ii. 25 115*, 339

John iii. 1 366, 563, 585
John iii. 2 84, 122, 527
John iii. 3 537
John iii. 4 331, 537
John iii. 5 537, 630
John iii. 6 178, 639
John iii. 8 298, 472, 510, 543
John iii. 9 537
John iii. 10 114, 115*, 537
John iii. 11 437, 517, 561
John iii. 12 235*, 478
John iii. 13 341*, 431, 537
John iii. 14 106*, 540
John iii. 16 133, 172*, 281, 301, 610
John iii. 17 537, 540
John iii. 18 272, 273, 474*, 480
John iii. 19 129, 155, 630
John iii. 20 111, 639
John iii. 21 122, 155, 639
John iii. 22 268, 376, 539, 593*
John iii. 23 144, 471, 514
John iii. 25 368
John iii. 26 212*
John iii. 27 499
John iii. 29 79, 199, 466*
John iii. 30 332, 537
John iii. 31 537
John iii. 32 437, 537
John iii. 33 155, 537
John iii. 34 424*, 543
John iii. 35 414
John iii. 36 266*

John iv. 1 144*, 239, 268, 540
John iv. 2 150, 444
John iv. 4 283*, 540

John iv. 5 113, 396, 444, 471, 540
John iv. 6 134, 367*, 392*, 540, 541, 562,
„ „ „ 618*
John iv. 7 537
John iv. 8 288, 562
John iv. 9 88, 152, 365, 523, 537
John iv. 10 152*, 537, 562
John iv. 11 132, 494*, 524, 537
John iv. 12 239, 519
John iv. 14 199, 397*, 507
John iv. 15 318, 488, 537
John iv. 16 537
John iv. 17 537
John iv. 18 110, 464*
John iv. 19 537, 551
John iv. 20 384
John iv. 21 183, 265, 296, 537
John iv. 22 480, 538
John iv. 23 111, 210, 420*, 424*, 448, 528
John iv. 24 538, 551
John iv. 25 308, 537
John iv. 26 537, 582
John iv. 27 376, 393*, 539
John iv. 28 396, 444
John iv. 29 114, 511
John iv. 30 86
John iv. 31 268, 545, 592*
John iv. 33 511*
John iv. 34 337*, 338, 537
John iv. 35 313, 539, 589, 626, 641*
John iv. 36 133, 459*
John iv. 37 114, 363
John iv. 38 272
John iv. 39 134, 540, 550
John iv. 40 177, 296, 335, 540
John iv. 41 540, 619
John iv. 42 114, 435, 540, 619*
John iv. 43 106
John iv. 44 447, 454*
John iv. 45 134, 275, 410
John iv. 46 61, 275
John iv. 47 70, 155, 274, 336
John iv. 48 65, 506, 507*
John iv. 49 79, 330*
John iv. 50 163, 537
John iv. 51 207
John iv. 52 230
John iv. 53 422, 519, 582
John iv. 54 604

John v. 1 118, 125*
John v. 2 112, 267*, 392*, 592*
John v. 3 128, 520
John v. 4 413*
John v. 5 59, 230*, 250, 256*
John v. 6 537
John v. 7 372, 386, 537, 599*
John v. 8 314, 537
John v. 9 539
John v. 10 331, 340
John v. 11 64, 160, 228, 314
John v. 12 135
John v. 13 91, 268, 342
John v. 14 501
John v. 15 64, 268
John v. 16 268
John v. 18 154, 268
John v. 19 261, 306, 307, 543
John v. 20 242, 287
John v. 21 123, 440, 541
John v. 22 131, 548*
John v. 23 475
John v. 24 273*
John v. 25 199, 296
John v. 26 266
John v. 27 439*
John v. 28 82
John v. 29 188, 354
John v. 30 495, 496, 499
John v. 32 109, 225, 513
John v. 35 114, 405, 614
John v. 36 133*, 245*
John v. 37 488, 489
John v. 38 489*
John v. 39 114
John v. 41 365
John v. 42 185, 263, 482, 626
John v. 43 390, 494, 537
John v. 44 152, 331*, 464*, 573, 578
John v. 45 109, 233, 273*, 537
John v. 46 363, 66, 304
John v. 47 285, 292, 477, 478

John vi. 1 191*, 207
John vi. 2 375*, 515
John vi. 3 106, 428, 456
John vi. 5 268, 279, 287, 607
John vi. 6 150, 564
John vi. 7 335, 337
John vi. 9 117, 141, 169
John vi. 10 73,74, 230*, 313, 443, 452*, 456*
John vi. 13 132, 201, 208, 514
John vi. 14 114
John vi. 15 228, 607
John vi. 16 275
John vi. 17 86, 429, 494, 596*

John vi. 18 435
John vi. 19 230, 250, 374*, 471
John vi. 21 268, 330, 375*, 467*, 614
John vi. 22 79, 131, 275, 568*
John vi. 23 564*
John vi. 24 57, 268
John vi. 26 496
John vi. 27 496*, 528, 534
John vi. 29 57, 159, 166, 338, 628
John vi. 30 152
John vi. 31 106*, 588*
John vi. 32 276
John vi. 33 343
John vi. 35 77, 506, 639
John vi. 36 439*
John vi. 37 178
John vi. 38 287
John vi. 39 83, 574, 589
John vi. 40 144, 338
John vi. 41 343, 431
John vi. 42 159
John vi. 43 376
John vi. 45 175, 189*
John vi. 46 597
John vi. 50 114, 199, 343, 366, 630
John vi. 51 86, 87, 114, 343, 443
John vi. 52 212
John vi. 54 552
John vi. 55 465*
John vi. 56 552
John vi. 57 399*, 440, 549
John vi. 58 86, 198
John vi. 60 551
John vi. 62 159, 600*
John vi. 63 114, 499, 538, 609
John vi. 64 124, 268, 475*, 543
John vi. 65 368
John vi. 66 367, 550
John vi. 68 279, 549
John vi. 69 553*
John vi. 70 436*
John vi. 71 70, 190

John vii. 1 268
John vii. 2 528
John vii. 3 79
John vii. 4 292, 630*
John vii. 6 132
John vii. 7 614*
John vii. 8 596*
John vii. 10 541, 617
John vii. 12 105
John vii. 13 185*
John vii. 14 270
John vii. 15 340, 483*, 496
John vii. 16 496*
John vii. 17 107, 293, 332, 373, 509, 537, ,, ,, ,, 541, 614
John vii. 18 537
John vii. 19 271, 508
John vii. 21 59*, 117
John vii. 22 271, 368, 421, 597
John vii. 23 459*, 508
John vii. 24 224, 314
John vii. 26 511
John vii. 27 298, 442, 510, 626
John vii. 28 437
John vii. 30 437
John vii. 31 58, 163, 511*
John vii. 32 288
John vii. 34 53, 552
John vii. 35 187*, 300*, 472, 511
John vii. 36 53, 494
John vii. 37 77, 293, 525
John vii. 38 89, 550, 574
John vii. 39 163
John vii. 40 107
John vii. 41 447*
John vii. 42 265, 411
John vii. 43 399
John vii. 44 330, 437
John vii. 45 157*, 632
John vii. 48 442, 366, 420
John vii. 49 442, 484, 486*, 515
John vii. 51 267, 523*, 588
John vii. 52 265, 266, 311*

John viii. 3 123
John viii. 4 72
John viii. 6 268
John viii. 7 394, 467
John viii. 8 268
John viii. 9 249, 621
John viii. 12 506, 513
John viii. 14 267, 441, 472
John viii. 15 583*
John viii. 16 293, 558
John viii. 18 538
John viii. 19 304, 488
John viii. 20 275, 385*, 480
John viii. 21 387, 388
John viii. 22 253, 511*
John viii. 23 109
John viii. 25 46, 167*, 230, 438, 457, 464* ,, ,, ,, 549
John viii. 26 416, 442, 451

John viii. 27 222
John viii. 29 277*
John viii. 33 271
John viii. 36 295
John viii. 37 413, 414*, 480
John viii. 38 455*
John viii. 39 305
John viii. 40 199*, 272, 528
John viii. 41 538
John viii. 42 304
John viii. 44 114*, 138, 145*, 308, 467*
John viii. 45 457
John viii. 51 293, 506
John viii. 52 506, 519
John viii. 53 545, 577*
John viii. 54 293, 574*, 626
John viii. 55 195*, 209, 482
John viii. 56 339*
John viii. 58 267, 330, 523
John viii. 59 253*, 469*

John ix. 1 139, 367
John ix. 2 58, 459*, 545
John ix. 3 177, 316, 317*, 488, 514
John ix. 4 296, 297, 332, 481
John ix. 5 144, 609
John ix. 6 427
John ix. 7 413, 415*, 563
John ix. 8 114, 268
John ix. 9 209
John ix. 10 72
John ix. 11 155, 415*, 427, 456
John ix. 13 58, 267, 528
John ix. 14 72, 443
John ix. 15 298
John ix. 17 83, 550
John ix. 18 275, 296
John ix. 19 114
John ix. 20 114
John ix. 21 83, 150, 152, 155, 298
John ix. 22 254, 262, 294, 336
John ix. 24 153
John ix. 25 298*, 341*
John ix. 26 155, 456
John ix. 27 331
John ix. 28 222
John ix. 29 66
John ix. 30 72, 184*, 446*
John ix. 31 160, 199, 549
John ix. 33 70, 305*, 477, 499
John ix. 36 437, 620*
John ix. 37 273, 274*, 540
John ix. 38 105, 210
John ix. 41 304

John x. 1 483
John x. 3 154, 537, 540
John x. 4 514, 537
John x. 5 84, 223, 507, 610
John x. 6 168, 298*
John x. 7 114, 187*
John x. 8 372, 514
John x. 9 540
John x. 10 606
John x. 11 106*, 132, 524, 539
John x. 12 514, 540
John x. 13 206, 373

John x. 15 382, 440
John x. 16 520
John x. 17 537
John x. 18 370
John x. 19 399
John x. 20 456
John x. 21 333, 514
John x. 22 112
John x. 23 67, 385
John x. 25 437, 514
John x. 27 514
John x. 28 83, 506
John x. 29 143, 144, 242
John x. 30 152, 518
John x. 32 265*, 368, 412, 525
John x. 33 152, 228, 412
John x. 35 478
John x. 36 580
John x. 37 478*
John x. 38 553
John x. 41 144

John xi. 1 364*, 370, 411*
John xi. 2 227, 343*, 562
John xi. 3 543
John xi. 4 383*, 405
John xi. 5 268, 443
John xi. 6 159, 165, 230, 541, 576
John xi. 7 603
John xi. 8 436, 472
John xi. 11 608*
John xi. 12 292
John xi. 13 531
John xi. 15 80, 339*, 459*
John xi. 18 112, 195, 372, 471, 557*
John xi. 19 275
John xi. 21 304
John xi. 25 87, 114, 513

John xi. 26 506
John xi. 27 273
John xi. 30 275, 456, 563*
John xi. 31 341, 626
John xi. 32 155, 159*, 304
John xi. 33 215*, 527
John xi. 37 70, 149, 337
John xi. 38 396*, 430
John xi. 39 313
John xi. 40 76
John xi. 41 396
John xi. 44 229, 278*, 313, 552
John xi. 45 168
John xi. 47 128, 284*
John xi. 48 155, 192, 607*
John xi. 49 118, 170*, 341
John xi. 50 337, 382
John xi. 51 70, 71, 562
John xi. 52 577
John xi. 54 421
John xi. 55 539
John xi. 56 506, 508*
John xi. 57 72, 275, 294, 336

John xii. 1 123, 557*
John xii. 2 268, 593*
John xii. 3 97*, 201*, 525*, 606
John xii. 5 116, 621*
John xii. 6 116, 206, 268
John xii. 7 274*
John xii. 8 150
John xii. 9 123, 515
John xii. 10 254*, 336
John xii. 11 191, 550
John xii. 12 106, 515, 526
John xii. 13 270, 603*
John xii. 15 549
John xii. 16 393, 541
John xii. 17 123, 270
John xii. 18 334, 347, 515
John xii. 20 353, 593*
John xii. 21 331, 370
John xii. 23 261, 339*, 460*
John xii. 25 83
John xii. 26 265
John xii. 27 442
John xii. 28 582*, 586
John xii. 29 334, 522
John xii. 32 86, 291
John xii. 33 70, 226
John xii. 34 261
John xii. 35 296, 538
John xii. 36 238
John xii. 40 155, 459, 494, 522*, 588
John xii. 41 457
John xii. 42 444
John xii. 43 241*
John xii. 44 456, 496, 497
John xii. 46 527
John xii. 47 144
John xii. 48 160, 483
John xii. 49 611

John xiii. 1 155, 339, 344, 372, 396, 460, „ „ „ 531, 572, 638
John xiii. 2 252*
John xiii. 3 272
John xiii. 4 176*, 267*
John xiii. 5 106, 614*
John xiii. 6 549, 88, 265*, 444, 508
John xiii. 7 543
John xiii. 8 506
John xiii. 9 552, 582
John xiii. 10 508
John xiii. 11 353, 562
John xiii. 12 271, 275
John xiii. 14 88, 292, 528, 549
John xiii. 16 239, 242, 488
John xiii. 17 296*, 612
John xiii. 18 316, 317*, 430, 620
John xiii. 22 233, 268
John xiii. 24 308*, 318
John xiii. 25 407*
John xiii. 27 243*, 265, 311*
John xiii. 28 405*, 626
John xiii. 29 158*, 313, 559, 577, 580
John xiii. 31 277*
John xiii. 32 292*
John xiii. 33 440
John xiii. 34 336, 464*, 524*, 550
John xiii. 35 173, 386

John xiv. 1 317, 501
John xiv. 3 265
John xiv. 7 273*, 304
John xiv. 9 549
John xiv. 11 585
John xiv. 15 314
John xiv. 16 530
John xiv. 17 488
John xiv. 19 585
John xiv. 21 114
John xiv. 22 562
John xiv. 23 256
John xiv. 24 475

John xiv. 26 227, 609
John xiv. 27 186, 609, 639
John xiv. 28 304* 513
John xiv. 30 60, 218, 436, 437
John xiv. 31 285

John xv. 1 132
John xv. 2 58, 111, 148, 343*, 483, 537, 574
John xv. 3 399, 537
John xv. 4 314, 384, 471, 537, 541, 582
John xv. 5 471*, 499*, 537, 578, 582
John xv. 6 141, 277*, 293, 522, 537, 632*
John xv. 7 310, 537
John xv. 8 161, 278*, 337*, 338*, 537
John xv. 9 537, 541
John xv. 10 153*, 537
John xv. 11 137, 537
John xv. 12 537
John xv. 13 338, 537, 539, 595*
John xv. 14 537
John xv. 15 537, 619
John xv. 16 78, 537, 607
John xv. 17 336, 537
John xv. 18 537
John xv. 19 304, 429, 537, 609
John xv. 20 163, 292*, 537
John xv. 21 537
John xv. 22 77, 192*, 305*, 373, 477, 537, 595
John xv. 23 537
John xv. 24 77, 271, 439, 475, 537
John xv. 25 317*, 588, 620
John xv. 26 141, 365, 429, 562
John xv. 27 267, 443

John xvi. 2 265, 339, 451*, 460
John xvi. 4 124
John xvi. 7 320, 337
John xvi. 8 421, 520
John xvi. 11 273
John xvi. 12 332
John xvi. 13 82, 308
John xvi. 14 266
John xvi. 15 266
John xvi. 17 75, 203, 265, 366*, 589
John xvi. 19 330
John xvi. 20 87, 90, 184
John xvi. 22 90, 558
John xvi. 23 227, 499
John xvi. 24 459, 499
John xvi. 25 296, 481
John xvi. 26 373
John xvi. 27 112, 150*, 365
John xvi. 30 122, 339, 387*
John xvi. 31 508
John xvi. 32 339, 460, 516*
John xvi. 33 291

John xvii. 2 75, 79, 145, 185*, 289
John xvii. 3 161, 290, 337, 338, 525
John xvii. 4 276*
John xvii. 5 163
John xvii. 6 76
John xvii. 7 76
John xvii. 8 553
John xvii. 9 159, 166, 421
John xvii. 10 273*, 389*, 389, 562
John xvii. 11 163, 183, 265
John xvii. 12 508
John xvii. 14 272
John xvii. 15 336, 410
John xvii. 17 538
John xvii. 18 277*, 440
John xvii. 22 274*, 582
John xvii. 23 585
John xvii. 24 123, 265
John xvii. 25 439
John xvii. 26 225

John xviii. 1 67
John xviii. 2 113, 376
John xviii. 3 106, 368, 377, 471, 472*
John xviii. 5 113, 582
John xviii. 6 73, 109
John xviii. 7 582
John xviii. 10 98, 182, 559
John xviii. 11 148*, 313, 512*
John xviii. 12 275*
John xviii. 13 60
John xviii. 14 319
John xviii. 15 519
John xviii. 16 395
John xviii. 20 117, 610
John xviii. 22 226
John xviii. 23 292
John xviii. 24 275
John xviii. 26 158, 159
John xviii. 28 267, 288
John xviii. 30 304, 477
John xviii. 31 581*
John xviii. 32 70, 226
John xviii. 34 151, 261
John xviii. 36 304
John xviii. 37 444, 457, 512*
John xviii. 38 152
John xviii. 39 339
John xviii. 40 582

John xix. 2 226, 430
John xix. 3 77, 182
John xix. 4 631
John xix. 5 564, 631*
John xix. 6 128, 610
John xix. 7 228
John xix. 9 267
John xix. 10 508, 609
John xix. 11 242, 305*
John xix. 12 429
John xix. 14 124, 189*
John xix. 16 456
John xix. 19 374, 376
John xix. 21 501
John xix. 22 271, 521
John xix. 23 111, 176, 562
John xix. 24 257, 285, 373, 502
John xix. 25 60, 131*, 190, 394
John xix. 26 183
John xix. 28 459*, 561
John xix. 29 201
John xix. 30 271
John xix. 31 70, 514*, 561, 562, 563
John xix. 32 70, 115, 576
John xix. 35 340
John xix. 36 162
John xix. 37 158
John xix. 38 632
John xix. 39 86
John xix. 41 499, 524

John xx. 1 106, 248, 343*, 366*, 396
John xx. 2 420, 522, 588*
John xx. 3 270, 519
John xx. 4 69, 464, 604*
John xx. 6 267
John xx. 7 376, 415*, 632
John xx. 9 123, 274
John xx. 11 395, 396
John xx. 12 173, 384, 395, 591*
John xx. 13 298
John xx. 14 537
John xx. 15 147*, 537, 632
John xx. 16 537
John xx. 17 201, 428, 537
John xx. 18 537
John xx. 19 123, 159, 176, 234, 248, 267, ,, ,, ,, 185, 473*, 585
John xx. 21 271, 541, 585
John xx. 22 312
John xx. 23 272, 291, 293
John xx. 24 483
John xx. 25 66
John xx. 26 123, 472, 537, 585
John xx. 27 610
John xx. 28 183*
John xx. 29 272*
John xx. 30 525

John xxi. 1 191, 374*, 443
John xxi. 2 109, 190, 518, 520
John xxi. 3 265, 284, 537
John xxi. 4 85, 408
John xxi. 5 511
John xxi. 6 313, 371, 618
John xxi. 8 65, 188, 216, 370, 557, 562
John xxi. 9 275
John xxi. 10 90, 199, 370, 589
John xxi. 11 250, 341
John xxi. 12 613*
John xxi. 13 607*
John xxi. 14 123
John xxi. 15 85, 190, 549
John xxi. 16 313, 604
John xxi. 17 545
John xxi. 18 253, 257, 268
John xxi. 20 407*
John xxi. 21 169, 550, 562, 586*
John xxi. 22 55, 152, 296, 586
John xxi. 23 265
John xxi. 24 343, 517
John xxi. 25 168, 333*, 482*, 525

Acts i. 1 183, 244, 256, 549, 559, 575*, 621*
Acts i. 2 164, 275, 542, 543, 556*
Acts i. 3 143, 188, 207, 575*
Acts i. 4 199, 545, 580
Acts i. 5 161*, 216, 412*, 540
Acts i. 6 105, 509
Acts i. 7 195*, 441*
Acts i. 8 125*, 407, 420
Acts i. 10 174, 175, 348, 438
Acts i. 11 85, 110, 430, 523, 549, 610
Acts i. 12 182*
Acts i. 13 113, 128, 131, 190, 518, 520
Acts i. 14 122, 521
Acts i. 15 250, 562, 563
Acts i. 16 183, 523
Acts i. 17 200*
Acts i. 18 88, 206, 514
Acts i. 19 112
Acts i. 20 286, 435
Acts i. 21 160, 407, 444, 624
Acts i. 22 164, 621
Acts i. 24 85, 152, 158*, 342*
Acts i. 25 432, 631

Acts i. 26 408, 433*

Acts ii. 1 328, 539
Acts ii. 2 348, 539
Acts ii. 3 516*, 539
Acts ii. 4 539, 614
Acts ii. 5 370, 407
Acts ii. 6 154, 516, 528
Acts ii. 9 112, 439
Acts ii. 10 400, 439
Acts ii. 11 345, 347
Acts ii. 12 303*, 516
Acts ii. 14 183, 391, 610
Acts ii. 17 77, 199, 370
Acts ii. 18 77, 438
Acts ii. 19 531
Acts ii. 20 330, 396
Acts ii. 22 379, 523
Acts ii. 23 73, 148
Acts ii. 24 31
Acts ii. 25 88, 397*
Acts ii. 26 71, 425*
Acts ii. 27 156, 592
Acts ii. 28 201, 376*
Acts ii. 29 113, 384, 549, 585
Acts ii. 30 226, 331, 455*, 603
Acts ii. 31 482, 592
Acts ii. 32 110
Acts ii. 33 214*, 237*, 435, 531, 559
Acts ii. 34 81, 215
Acts ii. 36 111*
Acts ii. 37 435
Acts ii. 38 393*, 397, 587
Acts ii. 39 307, 415*
Acts ii. 40 545
Acts ii. 41 433
Acts ii. 42 348
Acts ii. 43 65, 156, 211*, 379*, 439, 527
Acts ii. 45 306
Acts ii. 46 198, 401*
Acts ii. 47 110*

Acts iii. 1 408* 518
Acts iii. 2 171, 227, 325, 354*, 522, 543
Acts iii. 3 270, 354, 543, 608, 609
Acts iii. 4 233, 313
Acts iii. 5 593
Acts iii. 6 211
Acts iii. 7 192, 202*
Acts iii. 8 553
Acts iii. 10 66, 392, 626
Acts iii. 11 67, 392, 394, 526
Acts iii. 12 183, 261, 326*, 610, 617
Acts iii. 13 148, 149, 157*, 400, 575
Acts iii. 14 126, 523
Acts iii. 15 123
Acts iii. 16 133, 144, 378, 394*
Acts iii. 17 402*
Acts iii. 18 606
Acts iii. 19 310*, 462*
Acts iii. 20 462
Acts iii. 21 163, 462, 558
Acts iii. 22 82, 307, 401, 545
Acts iii. 23 156, 307, 480
Acts iii. 24 370, 633*
Acts iii. 25 114, 163, 225
Acts iii. 26 134*, 329*

Acts iv. 1 207, 427
Acts iv. 2 123, 133, 389
Acts iv. 3 396, 430, 590
Acts iv. 4 84, 276
Acts iv. 5 146*, 323, 415, 590
Acts iv. 7 390, 420, 527, 632*
Acts iv. 9 185*, 448
Acts iv. 11 114, 157*
Acts iv. 12 217*, 454*, 493
Acts iv. 13 268, 269*, 434, 544, 626
Acts iv. 15 593*
Acts iv. 16 284, 331
Acts iv. 17 393, 396, 466*, 481
Acts iv. 18 344, 481, 488
Acts iv. 19 518
Acts iv. 20 475, 481, 498*
Acts iv. 21 109, 299, 343*
Acts iv. 22 43, 196, 239, 531, 596
Acts iv. 23 128
Acts iv. 24 152, 404, 552
Acts iv. 27 439, 518
Acts iv. 29 45, 431
Acts iv. 33 78, 407, 435, 550
Acts iv. 34 384
Acts iv. 35 306, 403
Acts iv. 36 120, 230, 562

Acts v. 1 62, 171
Acts v. 2 253, 57, 62, 90, 199
Acts v. 4 212, 343*, 355, 495*, 497, 585
Acts v. 5 344, 408
Acts v. 7 58, 483, 563
Acts v. 8 206, 298
Acts v. 10 342, 405
Acts v. 12 65, 67, 363, 379, 564*, 607
Acts v. 13 564
Acts v. 14 564*
Acts v. 15 374, 376, 400*, 431, 564*

Acts v. 16 516, 526
Acts v. 17 520, 608
Acts v. 19 176, 380
Acts v. 20 237*, 238*, 634
Acts v. 21 407*
Acts v. 22 251*
Acts v. 23 372, 472, 545, 604
Acts v. 24 129, 275, 308, 439, 518
Acts v. 26 217, 288, 377, 505*
Acts v. 28 112, 201, 393, 408, 466, 481
Acts v. 29 332, 518, 520, 595*
Acts v. 30 374
Acts v. 31 214*, 228, 318
Acts v. 32 191*
Acts v. 35 60, 392, 549, 557*, 610
Acts v. 36 170*, 184, 261, 433*
Acts v. 37 106, 621
Acts v. 38 296*, 427, 519
Acts v. 39 122, 296*
Acts v. 40 393
Acts v. 42 345*, 435

Acts vi. 1 28, 268, 405
Acts vi. 2 85, 87
Acts vi. 3 375
Acts vi. 4 128
Acts vi. 5 26, 103, 113, 120, 214, 233
Acts vi. 6 632
Acts vi. 7 268, 435
Acts vi. 8 113
Acts vi. 9 112, 129*, 420
Acts vi. 11 67
Acts vi. 13 128, 382

Acts vii. 2 330, 341
Acts vii. 3 429
Acts vii. 4 329, 413, 415, 422
Acts vii. 5 276*, 331, 397
Acts vii. 8 61, 113, 218
Acts vii. 9 61, 376
Acts vii. 10 73, 138*, 228, 527
Acts vii. 11 407
Acts vii. 12 63, 345, 347
Acts vii. 14 113, 250, 391*
Acts vii. 15 519
Acts vii. 16 70, 90, 163, 190, 206
Acts vii. 17 163
Acts vii. 19 157, 326*, 329
Acts vii. 20 212, 248*
Acts vii. 21 73, 143, 147, 228*, 528
Acts vii. 22 227*
Acts vii. 24 258, 632*
Acts vii. 26 48, 269, 341, 435
Acts vii. 27 71, 90, 269
Acts vii. 29 121, 387*
Acts vii. 30 106*
Acts vii. 32 114, 585
Acts vii. 33 313
Acts vii. 34 354
Acts vii. 35 63, 67, 159
Acts vii. 36 121, 524
Acts vii. 37 82, 85
Acts vii. 38 118, 421
Acts vii. 39 40, 71, 90
Acts vii. 40 67, 110, 148, 182, 300*
Acts vii. 41 232
Acts vii. 42 43, 175, 251, 469*, 512*
Acts vii. 43 75, 210
Acts vii. 44 66
Acts vii. 45 71, 90, 174
Acts vii. 46 71
Acts vii. 47 71
Acts vii. 48 554
Acts vii. 51 215, 440
Acts vii. 53 228*, 398*
Acts vii. 58 254
Acts vii. 59 549
Acts vii. 60 226

Acts viii. 1 113, 133, 400, 443
Acts viii. 2 256, 276, 443
Acts viii. 3 113, 443, 552
Acts viii. 4 559
Acts viii. 5 113, 125, 145
Acts viii. 6 113, 329, 435
Acts viii. 7 443, 584
Acts viii. 8 443
Acts viii. 9 170*, 443
Acts viii. 10 114, 370
Acts viii. 11 218, 329, 334
Acts viii. 12 113
Acts viii. 13 348, 435
Acts viii. 14 259, 271
Acts viii. 15 71, 122, 373
Acts viii. 16 350*, 430, 499, 562
Acts viii. 17 122, 269
Acts viii. 19 46, 158, 287, 307
Acts viii. 20 286
Acts viii. 21 211
Acts viii. 22 198, 300, 370, 445, 542, 622
Acts viii. 24 158*, 166, 430, 477
Acts viii. 25 223
Acts viii. 26 119*, 121, 157*, 400
Acts viii. 27 318, 341, 375, 593*
Acts viii. 28 348, 374, 435
Acts viii. 30 510, 638

Acts viii. 31 295, 303*, 304, 335, 435, 447
Acts viii. 34 420
Acts viii. 35 71, 607*
Acts viii. 36 268, 400, 407, 604
Acts viii. 38 528
Acts viii. 39 226, 415, 499
Acts viii. 40 71, 415*, 616*, 621

Acts ix. 1 204*
Acts ix. 2 106, 107, 195, 196, 227, 294, „ „ „ 396, 552, 559
Acts ix. 3 323, 366, 426, 432, 486
Acts ix. 4 610
Acts ix. 6 41, 79, 168, 587*
Acts ix. 7 44, 486
Acts ix. 8 72, 113
Acts ix. 9 486*, 488
Acts ix. 11 182, 313, 454*
Acts ix. 12 182, 430
Acts ix. 13 371, 549
Acts ix. 15 587
Acts ix. 17 106, 287, 430, 562
Acts ix. 18 427, 439
Acts ix. 20 268, 626
Acts ix. 21 114, 161, 270, 275, 288, 340, „ „ „ 354, 457
Acts ix. 24 207, 435, 552
Acts ix. 26 268, 484
Acts ix. 27 46, 202, 301
Acts ix. 31 185, 219, 382, 420
Acts ix. 32 61, 323
Acts ix. 33 367
Acts ix. 34 79, 594*
Acts ix. 35 61, 275
Acts ix. 37 178*, 323
Acts ix. 38 61, 471
Acts ix. 39 253, 254, 376
Acts ix. 40 105, 345
Acts ix. 42 213*, 382
Acts ix. 43 323

Acts x. 1 61, 62, 171
Acts x. 3 230
Acts x. 4 632
Acts x. 5 313, 396
Acts x. 6 121, 211, 395, 404
Acts x. 7 145, 632*
Acts x. 9 124, 407, 544
Acts x. 10 146, 147, 330, 408, 430
Acts x. 11 267, 376*, 635
Acts x. 13 586
Acts x. 14 171, 441, 475, 499
Acts x. 15 152, 543, 586, 604
Acts x. 16 422
Acts x. 17 268, 308, 371*, 408, 438, 605
Acts x. 18 268, 298, 543
Acts x. 20 41, 442, 451, 477
Acts x. 21 584
Acts x. 22 61, 138, 199, 322*, 434
Acts x. 23 253*
Acts x. 24 348
Acts x. 25 328*
Acts x. 26 153
Acts x. 28 435, 437, 449*, 481
Acts x. 30 43, 80
Acts x. 32 121, 138*, 404, 528
Acts x. 33 345, 592
Acts x. 35 120, 574
Acts x. 36 149, 164, 564*, 574*
Acts x. 37 382, 564*
Acts x. 38 227
Acts x. 39 163, 363, 439, 559, 560, 625*
Acts x. 41 123, 140, 171
Acts x. 42 50, 552
Acts x. 45 424
Acts x. 47 326, 511
Acts x. 48 435

Acts xi. 1 341, 400
Acts xi. 5 42, 80, 635*
Acts xi. 6 270
Acts xi. 8 441
Acts xi. 10 422
Acts xi. 11 408, 427
Acts xi. 13 106, 435
Acts xi. 14 152, 518
Acts xi. 15 124, 614*
Acts xi. 16 205, 216, 412*, 602
Acts xi. 17 80, 443, 603, 628*
Acts xi. 19 371, 372*, 392*
Acts xi. 20 268
Acts xi. 21 435
Acts xi. 22 133, 609*
Acts xi. 23 335, 433
Acts xi. 24 524
Acts xi. 26 95, 323
Acts xi. 28 63, 75, 89, 334, 375*, 526
Acts xi. 29 71, 516
Acts xi. 30 606

Acts xii. 1 113, 138, 540
Acts xii. 2 62, 216, 540
Acts xii. 3 268, 468*, 540, 562, 563
Acts xii. 5 540
Acts xii. 6 64, 177, 435, 539, 540
Acts xii. 7 73, 79, 429, 539, 540

Acts xii. 8 314, 435, 539, 540
Acts xii. 9 442, 539, 540
Acts xii. 10 72, 126, 132, 464, 540
Acts xii. 11 73, 152, 540
Acts xii. 12 435, 539, 540
Acts xii. 13 540, 545
Acts xii. 14 50, 371, 442, 540
Acts xii. 15 540
Acts xii. 16 345, 467*, 540, 544
Acts xii. 17 539, 540
Acts xii. 18 45, 298, 301, 445, 540
Acts xii. 19 396, 415*, 437, 540
Acts xii. 20 371, 375, 410, 540
Acts xii. 21 142*, 146, 218, 540
Acts xii. 22 142, 540
Acts xii. 23 540
Acts xii. 24 539, 540
Acts xii. 25 518, 539, 544

Acts xiii. 1 400, 520
Acts xiii. 2 262*, 313, 422
Acts xiii. 3 143, 521, 584*
Acts xiii. 4 539
Acts xiii. 8 138, 561, 562, 563
Acts xiii. 9 107*
Acts xiii. 10 124, 183, 315, 345, 510*, 549
Acts xiii. 11 251, 268, 486, 585
Acts xiii. 12 232
Acts xiii. 13 109, 187, 372, 406*
Acts xiii. 15 183, 218
Acts xiii. 16 183, 610
Acts xiii. 17 377
Acts xiii. 19 121
Acts xiii. 20 218, 250
Acts xiii. 21 230
Acts xiii. 22 113, 131, 180, 190, 228, 527
Acts xiii. 23 192* 238
Acts xiii. 24 607
Acts xiii. 25 169*, 319, 543
Acts xiii. 26 237*, 238*
Acts xiii. 27 454*
Acts xiii. 28 484
Acts xiii. 29 454
Acts xiii. 30 123
Acts xiii. 31 405, 408, 543
Acts xiii. 32 223, 227, 454, 626
Acts xiii. 34 618*
Acts xiii. 35 592*
Acts xiii. 36 432, 540
Acts xiii. 37 158, 543
Acts xiii. 39 57, 422
Acts xiii. 40 175, 430, 504
Acts xiii. 41 293, 508
Acts xiii. 43 128, 542
Acts xiii. 44 435
Acts xiii. 45 355*
Acts xiii. 46 151, 518, 539
Acts xiii. 47 228, 259, 528
Acts xiii. 48 69, 262*, 543
Acts xiii. 49 378*
Acts xiii. 50 126, 539
Acts xiii. 51 342

Acts xiv. 1 301, 323, 401*, 559
Acts xiv. 3 379
Acts xiv. 4 104, 391
Acts xiv. 5 319, 560
Acts xiv. 8 73, 215
Acts xiv. 9 324, 543
Acts xiv. 10 48, 82, 108, 464, 528, 553*
Acts xiv. 11 431, 539
Acts xiv. 12 66, 150*, 539
Acts xiv. 13 90, 372, 630
Acts xiv. 14 257, 344, 518
Acts xiv. 15 209, 543, 552, 628
Acts xiv. 16 219
Acts xiv. 17 78, 156, 201, 444*
Acts xiv. 18 325
Acts xiv. 19 321, 344, 544
Acts xiv. 20 391
Acts xiv. 21 223, 420, 539
Acts xiv. 22 430
Acts xiv. 23 73
Acts xiv. 26 472
Acts xiv. 27 376, 542

Acts xv. 1 215, 293
Acts xv. 2 373
Acts xv. 3 431
Acts xv. 4 127, 259, 420, 435, 539
Acts xv. 5 301, 370
Acts xv. 6 128, 539
Acts xv. 7 226*, 606
Acts xv. 8 440
Acts xv. 10 152, 318* 488, 542
Acts xv. 12 177, 379, 515
Acts xv. 13 183, 329
Acts xv. 16 469*
Acts xv. 17 141, 310
Acts xv. 19 481
Acts xv. 20 127, 326*, 427, 520
Acts xv. 21 401*
Acts xv. 22 255*, 567, 627
Acts xv. 23 128, 133, 316, 588, 606
Acts xv. 24 322, 344, 545
Acts xv. 25 320, 545, 627

Acts xv. 26 545
Acts xv. 27 342*
Acts xv. 29 315, 345, 427, 520
Acts xv. 31 232
Acts xv. 36 142*, 298, 626, 627*
Acts xv. 37 70
Acts xv. 38 372*, 481, 482
Acts xv. 39 435

Acts xvi. 2 260, 420
Acts xvi. 3 607, 626
Acts xvi. 4 268, 296, 431
Acts xvi. 5 215
Acts xvi. 7 333, 400, 476*, 494
Acts xvi. 9 112, 219*, 313, 380
Acts xvi. 10 262*
Acts xvi. 11 590

Acts xvi. 13 403
Acts xvi. 14 433, 543
Acts xvi. 15 292, 314, 545
Acts xvi. 16 257*, 323, 543
Acts xvi. 18 553
Acts xvi. 19 202
Acts xvi. 21 332, 493
Acts xvi. 22 269*, 332
Acts xvi. 23 539
Acts xvi. 24 69, 111, 542, 622
Acts xvi. 25 401*, 518
Acts xvi. 26 63, 72, 176, 549
Acts xvi. 27 70, 334*, 544
Acts xvi. 28 222, 226, 501
Acts xvi. 29 433
Acts xvi. 31 76, 518
Acts xvi. 33 197, 372*
Acts xvi. 34 44, 346, 435, 539, 627
Acts xvi. 37 41, 73, 446*, 591
Acts xvi. 39 335
Acts xvi. 40 396

Acts xvii. 2 209, 211, 215, 217, 372*, 584*
Acts xvii. 3 330, 580
Acts xvii. 4 262
Acts xvii. 6 61, 73, 219, 484
Acts xvii. 9 420
Acts xvii. 10 112, 129, 543
Acts xvii. 11 299*, 377
Acts xvii. 12 523
Acts xvii. 13 82, 112
Acts xvii. 14 129, 617*
Acts xvii. 15 112, 420
Acts xvii. 16 112, 632
Acts xvii. 18 71, 105, 171, 303*, 593*
Acts xvii. 20 169
Acts xvii. 21 71, 244*, 549
Acts xvii. 22 244*, 523, 610
Acts xvii. 24 120, 545
Acts xvii. 25 200, 637
Acts xvii. 26 407, 539
Acts xvii. 27 76, 299*, 485
Acts xvii. 28 104, 154, 389, 400*, 454*
„ „ „ 540, 640*
Acts xvii. 29 441, 491*
Acts xvii. 30 433
Acts xvii. 31 163, 389*, 410, 424, 463
Acts xvii. 32 82, 104, 123, 528

Acts xviii. 1 112
Acts xviii. 2 120, 182, 215, 329, 343, 543
Acts xviii. 3 72, 230, 395
Acts xviii. 4 539, 552
Acts xviii. 5 129, 341, 518
Acts xviii. 6 176*, 587
Acts xviii. 7 182
Acts xviii. 8 113
Acts xviii. 9 610
Acts xviii. 10 593*
Acts xviii. 11 249
Acts xviii. 12 206
Acts xviii. 13 404
Acts xviii. 14 72, 183, 304, 401
Acts xviii. 15 154
Acts xviii. 17 113, 202, 205
Acts xviii. 18 253
Acts xviii. 19 150, 209
Acts xviii. 20 242
Acts xviii. 21 415, 603
Acts xviii. 22 544
Acts xviii. 24 62, 120, 341
Acts xviii. 25 268
Acts xviii. 26 243, 539, 614*
Acts xviii. 27 259
Acts xviii. 28 209

Acts xix. 1 62, 219, 323, 543
Acts xix. 2 539, 298, 451, 493, 509
Acts xix. 3 397*, 439, 539
Acts xix. 4 530, 550, 576
Acts xix. 6 71, 539
Acts xix. 10 408, 552
Acts xix. 11 140, 539, 606
Acts xix. 12 428, 435
Acts xix. 13 226, 408
Acts xix. 14 60, 170
Acts xix. 16 132, 429, 431
Acts xix. 17 140

Acts xix. 19 527, 592
Acts xix. 22 251*, 415*
Acts xix. 24 253, 257, 341
Acts xix. 25 367, 406, 543
Acts xix. 26 110, 321, 498*
Acts xix. 27 44, 184*, 196, 228, 550
Acts xix. 28 584
Acts xix. 29 201, 353*
Acts xix. 31 594, 61, 171, 335, 481
Acts xix. 32 242
Acts xix. 33 209, 330, 332
Acts xix. 34 567*, 584
Acts xix. 35 234, 300, 447, 481, 523, 592
Acts xix. 37 222
Acts xix. 38 53, 590*
Acts xix. 39 292
Acts xix. 40 203, 448

Acts xx. 1 543, 609*
Acts xx. 2 145
Acts xx. 3 112, 211, 324, 428, 539, 567
Acts xx. 4 103, 138*, 519, 520, 593
Acts xx. 7 248, 435, 539
Acts xx. 9 341, 371, 375*, 431, 545
Acts xx. 10 430
Acts xx. 11 541
Acts xx. 12 276
Acts xx. 13 262*
Acts xx. 14 415*
Acts xx. 15 112, 590
Acts xx. 16 211, 294, 319, 477
Acts xx. 17 112
Acts xx. 18 298*, 422, 430, 549
Acts xx. 20 325, 545
Acts xx. 21 66, 559
Acts xx. 22 215, 483
Acts xx. 23 63, 340, 508
Acts xx. 24 186, 318
Acts xx. 25 384
Acts xx. 26 197
Acts xx. 27 325, 482, 604
Acts xx. 28 228, 527
Acts xx. 29 205, 396, 484*
Acts xx. 30 621
Acts xx. 31 552
Acts xx. 32 391*
Acts xx. 33 204
Acts xx. 34 577
Acts xx. 35 240
Acts xx. 38 163

Acts xxi. 1 62, 323, 427, 590
Acts xxi. 2 342*, 344
Acts xxi. 3 112, 260*, 270, 349*, 472
Acts xxi. 4 322*, 481, 543
Acts xxi. 5 122, 323, 552
Acts xxi. 6 430
Acts xxi. 8 134*, 592*
Acts xxi. 9 523
Acts xxi. 11 155, 552
Acts xxi. 12 325, 439
Acts xxi. 13 332, 609*
Acts xxi. 16 165, 203, 214*, 341, 513, 589*
Acts xxi. 17 207, 465
Acts xxi. 18 435
Acts xxi. 19 158
Acts xxi. 21 219, 322*
Acts xxi. 23 211
Acts xxi. 24 75, 255
Acts xxi. 25 128, 223, 520
Acts xxi. 26 218, 255, 275, 296
Acts xxi. 28 114, 272, 344*, 439, 578*
Acts xxi. 29 321
Acts xxi. 30 86
Acts xxi. 31 62, 215*
Acts xxi. 32 61
Acts xxi. 33 168, 299*, 308
Acts xxi. 34 484
Acts xxi. 35 323
Acts xxi. 36 516, 526
Acts xxi. 37 509
Acts xxi. 38 106, 114, 134, 511*
Acts xxi. 39 313, 528, 545

Acts xxii. 2 432
Acts xxii. 3 187, 189*, 340*, 559*
Acts xxii. 4 543
Acts xxii. 5 141, 472
Acts xxii. 6 121, 220, 323, 406*, 432
Acts xxii. 7 73
Acts xxii. 9 540, 550
Acts xxii. 10 163
Acts xxii. 11 268, 371*, 481
Acts xxii. 12 528
Acts xxii. 13 54, 218, 313, 428
Acts xxii. 15 110, 158
Acts xxii. 17 220*, 323*, 577
Acts xxii. 18 137*
Acts xxii. 19 213*, 401
Acts xxii. 21 396
Acts xxii. 22 282*
Acts xxii. 24 85, 301
Acts xxii. 25 61, 208, 509
Acts xxii. 26 61
Acts xxii. 28 439
Acts xxii. 29 443

Acts xxii. 30 109, 261, 365*, 398*

Acts xxiii. 1 111, 262
Acts xxiii. 3 81, 332, 340
Acts xxiii. 5 222, 316, 502, 641*
Acts xxiii. 6 195, 203, 437, 631
Acts xxiii. 7 128
Acts xxiii. 8 481, 493*, 540
Acts xxiii. 9 519, 599, 600*
Acts xxiii. 10 504, 545, 600
Acts xxiii. 11 621
Acts xxiii. 12 297
Acts xxiii. 13 239, 256, 596
Acts xxiii. 14 44, 128, 150, 297, 466*, 543
Acts xxiii. 15 287, 313, 324, 329
Acts xxiii. 19 202
Acts xxiii. 20 301
Acts xxiii. 21 193*, 297, 371, 596
Acts xxiii. 22 54, 545, 579
Acts xxiii. 23 61, 170*, 313*, 579
Acts xxiii. 24 138, 579, 621
Acts xxiii. 26 588
Acts xxiii. 27 134*, 544
Acts xxiii. 29 203
Acts xxiii. 30 278, 315, 375, 568*
Acts xxiii. 34 364, 366, 411, 582
Acts xxiii. 35 308, 332, 558

Acts xxiv. 1 534
Acts xxiv. 2 614*
Acts xxiv. 3 47, 200, 637
Acts xxiv. 4 561
Acts xxiv. 5 133, 208, 351, 567*
Acts xxiv. 6 351*, 543, 567*
Acts xxiv. 7 217
Acts xxiv. 8 76, 365, 543
Acts xxiv. 9 614
Acts xxiv. 10 346, 367
Acts xxiv. 11 239, 318, 341, 592, 596
Acts xxiv. 12 441, 491
Acts xxiv. 13 203, 491
Acts xxiv. 14 161, 219
Acts xxiv. 15 334
Acts xxiv. 17 550, 213, 342, 380*, 453
Acts xxiv. 19 54, 282, 294*
Acts xxiv. 20 77, 85, 375
Acts xxiv. 21 123, 164, 203
Acts xxiv. 22 560*
Acts xxiv. 23 61
Acts xxiv. 25 334, 342, 463
Acts xxiv. 26 209

Acts xxv. 1 369*, 540, 544
Acts xxv. 2 539, 540
Acts xxv. 3 338, 341
Acts xxv. 4 540
Acts xxv. 5 77, 540, 558
Acts xxv. 6 239, 344, 540, 544, 596
Acts xxv. 7 330, 373, 432, 525*, 540
Acts xxv. 9 375
Acts xxv. 10 227, 242*
Acts xxv. 11 203, 253, 267*, 456, 540
Acts xxv. 12 262*, 538
Acts xxv. 13 138, 342, 518, 544
Acts xxv. 14 401, 527
Acts xxv. 15 128, 373, 543
Acts xxv. 16 122, 297, 300
Acts xxv. 17 256, 475
Acts xxv. 18 168, 373*
Acts xxv. 20 299, 397, 543
Acts xxv. 21 143, 332
Acts xxv. 22 82, 283*, 558, 587
Acts xxv. 23 60, 402, 420, 560
Acts xxv. 24 303, 499, 515, 516, 549
Acts xxv. 26 288*
Acts xxv. 27 89, 319

Acts xxvi. 1 229, 268
Acts xxvi. 2 321
Acts xxvi. 3 154, 231*, 400, 559, 572
Acts xxvi. 4 124, 133, 136, 576
Acts xxvi. 5 401, 527, 626
Acts xxvi 6 394, 397
Acts xxvi. 7 100, 331, 543, 549, 552, 593
Acts xxvi. 8 395*, 542
Acts xxvi 9 138
Acts xxvi. 10 107, 545
Acts xxvi. 11 268, 545
Acts xxvi. 12 133, 386, 545
Acts xxvi. 13 403, 545
Acts xxvi. 14 396, 545
Acts xxvi. 15 85
Acts xxvi. 16 142, 158, 161, 166, 262*
„ „ „ 439, 442, 543, 545
Acts xxvi. 17 141, 429, 545, 550
Acts xxvi. 18 139*, 325, 421, 545
Acts xxvi. 19 68, 549
Acts xxvi. 20 352, 420, 435, 627
Acts xxvi. 22 133, 140, 158, 455*, 485,
„ „ „ 550, 559
Acts xxvi. 23 97*, 123
Acts xxvi. 24 108, 132, 514, 549, 550
Acts xxvi. 25 40, 558
Acts xxvi. 26 500*
Acts xxvi. 27 549
Acts xxvi. 29 209, 212, 235, 303*, 420*, 440

Acts xxvi. 30 126, 128, 519
Acts xxvi. 31 267*
Acts xxvi. 32 70, 305, 334, 477

Acts xxvii. 1 62, 78, 182, 261, 326*, 540
Acts xxvii. 2 224*, 400, 430
Acts xxvii. 3 200, 321*, 539
Acts xxvii. 5 133, 187, 431*
Acts xxvii. 6 525
Acts xxvii. 7 484
Acts xxvii. 8 471, 539
Acts xxvii. 9 63, 334, 543
Acts xxvii. 10 334, 339*, 573
Acts xxvii. 12 242, 299, 400, 405, 545
Acts xxvii. 13 243*, 334*, 594*
Acts xxvii. 14 147, 251*, 381*, 558
Acts xxvii. 17 209, 210, 504
Acts xxvii. 18 256
Acts xxvii. 20 120, 484, 488, 610
Acts xxvii. 21 87, 183, 282, 443, 481
Acts xxvii. 22 223, 508, 633*
Acts xxvii. 23 218, 543
Acts xxvii. 25 183
Acts xxvii. 27 123
Acts xxvii. 28 252*
Acts xxvii. 29 71, 366, 504, 539
Acts xxvii. 30 62
Acts xxvii. 31 61
Acts xxvii. 33 44, 70, 198, 335, 348
Acts xxvii. 34 364, 374*
Acts xxvii. 35 71, 614*
Acts xxvii. 36 198
Acts xxvii. 37 80, 250
Acts xxvii. 38 106, 201
Acts xxvii. 39 294, 557*
Acts xxvii. 40 64, 591, 594
Acts xxvii. 42 336, 502*, 545
Acts xxvii. 43 196, 251*, 528
Acts xxvii. 44 105, 323, 528

Acts xxviii. 2 420, 539
Acts xxviii. 3 257*, 368*, 371
Acts xxviii. 4 366
Acts xxviii. 6 268, 396*, 416
Acts xxviii. 8 323
Acts xxviii. 9 456
Acts xxviii. 11 216
Acts xxviii. 13 465, 528
Acts xxviii. 14 392
Acts xxviii. 16 62, 73
Acts xxviii. 17 127, 129, 323, 485
Acts xxviii. 18 70, 482
Acts xxviii. 20 229
Acts xxviii. 21 85, 489
Acts xxviii. 23 121, 372, 420, 422, 439, „ „ „ 543, 559
Acts xxviii. 24 104
Acts xxviii. 25 61, 602
Acts xxviii. 26 51, 85
Acts xxviii. 27 494, 503
Acts xxviii. 28 82

Rom. i. 1 125, 545, 565
Rom. i. 2 543, 545, 565
Rom. i. 3 186, 545, 565
Rom. i. 4 123, 188*, 237, 367*, 545, 565
Rom. i. 5 120, 186, 379*, 383, 384, 402, „ „ „ 517, 543, 545, 565, 631
Rom. i. 6 195*, 517, 543, 545, 565
Rom. i. 7 124, 139, 219, 234, 545, 565, 585
Rom. i. 8 378, 383, 575, 576*
Rom. i. 9 386, 410
Rom. i. 10 300, 376*
Rom. i. 11 198*
Rom. i. 12 155, 577
Rom. i. 13 438, 440, 561, 562, 565
Rom. i. 14 209, 439
Rom. i. 15 223, 230, 235
Rom. i. 16 221, 247*, 576*
Rom. i. 17 59, 136*, 186*, 396, 419, 513
Rom. i. 19 235*
Rom. i. 20 123, 125, 128, 216, 235*, 439, 638
Rom. i. 21 71, 582, 624*
Rom. i. 22 321, 627
Rom. i. 23 206, 388*, 524
Rom. i. 24 213, 263*, 326*, 387, 417*
Rom. i. 25 404*
Rom. i. 26 237, 404, 571*
Rom. i. 27 417, 571*
Rom. i. 28 480, 485, 638
Rom. i. 29 120, 217, 520, 553, 637
Rom. i. 30 53*
Rom. i. 31 553, 637
Rom. i. 32 123, 206, 344*

Rom. ii. 1 135, 183, 387*, 533
Rom. ii. 2 401
Rom. ii. 3 152, 161*, 183, 509
Rom. ii. 4 190, 235, 353
Rom. ii. 5 125, 188*, 402, 417*
Rom. ii. 7 187*, 519, 639
Rom. ii. 8 424, 578
Rom. ii. 9 156*, 552, 576*, 578
Rom. ii. 10 578
Rom. ii. 11 395, 447
Rom. ii. 12 123, 378, 386*, 447

Rom. ii. 13 186*, 447, 565*
Rom. ii. 14 139*, 141, 211, 309, 447, 483
,, ,, ,, 556*, 565*, 620
Rom. ii. 15 440, 565*, 580*, 615
Rom. ii. 17 76, 122, 233, 569*, 610
Rom. ii. 18 263, 569*, 594
Rom. ii. 19 321, 520, 569*
Rom. ii. 20 569*
Rom. ii. 21 322*, 481, 508, 569*
Rom. ii. 22 481
Rom. ii. 23 123, 233, 569
Rom. ii. 25 293
Rom. ii. 26 145, 228, 259, 293
Rom. ii. 27 134*, 343*, 380*, 454*
Rom. ii. 28 421, 454*, 488, 584*
Rom. ii. 29 116

Rom. iii. 1 174, 584
Rom. iii. 2 229, 260*, 454*, 514, 575, 576
Rom. iii. 3 585, 638
Rom. iii. 4 254, 310, 442
Rom. iii. 5 594, 122, 402, 511, 563
Rom. iii. 6 279, 480, 500
Rom. iii. 7 580
Rom. iii. 8 287, 580, 628*
Rom. iii. 9 59, 60, 120, 258*, 264*, 407,
,, ,, ,, 548, 552, 554*, 585
Rom. iii. 10 173
Rom. iii. 11 81, 109
Rom. iii. 13 77, 407*
Rom. iii. 18 185
Rom. iii. 19 110, 460
Rom. iii. 20 171, 186, 280*
Rom. iii. 21 186*, 271
Rom. iii. 22 186, 418*, 443
Rom. iii. 23 201, 274, 352, 353
Rom. iii. 24 216, 217*, 352*
Rom. iii. 25 96*, 137, 152*, 228, 254, 378,
,, ,, ,, 399, 412, 527
Rom. iii. 26 368, 412
Rom. iii. 27 116, 582
Rom. iii. 28 120, 456, 595*
Rom. iii. 29 192*
Rom. iii. 30 116, 186, 280*, 362*, 411*, 448
Rom. iii. 31 78, 87, 123, 609

Rom. iv. 1 113, 334, 508
Rom. iv. 2 306*
Rom. iv. 3 453*, 523*
Rom. iv. 4 35, 108, 402*
Rom. iv. 5 186, 483
Rom. iv. 7 81
Rom. iv. 8 506, 585
Rom. iv. 9 129, 321, 409, 420, 587*, 595*
Rom. iv. 10 386, 420
Rom. iv. 11 133, 190, 380, 531
Rom. iv. 12 209, 211, 219, 534, 555*, 577
Rom. iv. 13 123, 186*, 320, 441, 447,
,, ,, ,, 453*, 586
Rom. iv. 14 59, 109, 123, 273, 292, 368,
,, ,, ,, 447, 585, 595
Rom. iv. 15 123, 447, 456
Rom. iv. 16 69, 368, 585, 598*
Rom. iv. 17 164, 165*
Rom. iv. 18 329, 404, 411, 465
Rom. iv. 19 50, 486*
Rom. iv. 20 215*, 216, 261, 342, 344, 397
Rom. iv. 21 262
Rom. iv. 22 523*
Rom. iv. 24 123, 628
Rom. iv. 25 611, 639

Rom. v. 1 186*, 378, 406
Rom. v. 2 583, 136*, 233, 271, 379
Rom. v. 3 233, 583*
Rom. v. 5 453, 107, 185, 378, 413, 414, 417
Rom. v. 6 124, 382, 383, 447, 453*, 553
Rom. v. 7 117*, 279*, 447, 453*, 613
Rom. v. 8 137, 383, 553
Rom. v. 9 197, 594
Rom. v. 10 262
Rom. v. 11 351*, 583*
Rom. v. 12 144, 158*, 394, 396, 562, 569*
,, ,, ,, 599, 609
Rom. v. 13 85, 123, 475, 570
Rom. v. 14 82, 206, 394*, 409, 442, 542, 570
Rom. v. 15 110, 442, 541, 570*
Rom. v. 16 60, 82, 340*, 368, 396, 584*
Rom. v. 17 353
Rom. v. 18 188, 440, 445, 558, 570*, 587*
Rom. v. 19 110, 421, 587, 638
Rom. v. 20 123, 459
Rom. v. 21 397, 418*, 440

Rom. vi. 1 279, 285
Rom. vi. 2 86, 168, 210, 279*, 386, 428
Rom. vi. 3 136, 509
Rom. vi. 4 136, 137, 236, 288, 444
Rom. vi. 5 292, 442*, 451
Rom. vi. 6 161, 188*, 326, 612*, 615
Rom. vi. 8 49, 86, 391
Rom. vi. 9 538
Rom. vi. 10 168*, 210, 227, 422, 428
Rom. vi. 11 210*, 228, 389*
Rom. vi. 12 488, 502, 524*
Rom. vi. 13 314, 488

Rom. vi. 14 120, 279*, 316*
Rom. vi. 15 82, 279, 420, 585
Rom. vi. 16 158, 266, 440, 612*
Rom. vi. 17 164*, 261*, 368, 585, 629*
Rom. vi. 18 197, 210
Rom. vi. 19 128, 210 397
Rom. vi. 20 210*
Rom. vi. 21 60, 141, 158*, 221
Rom. vi. 22 197, 417*
Rom. vi. 23 176, 389

Rom. vii. 1 123, 446, 562, 565, 589
Rom. vii. 2 188*, 209, 271*, 293, 446, 621
Rom. vii. 3 280, 324, 343, 445, 558
Rom. vii. 4 118, 210*, 301, 381*
Rom. vii. 5 133, 189, 258, 329
Rom. vii. 6 159, 236
Rom. vii. 7 189, 305*, 316, 448*, 477
Rom. vii. 8 575
Rom. vii. 9 87
Rom. vii. 10 133, 160, 189, 616*, 621
Rom. vii. 11 189
Rom. vii. 12 520, 575*
Rom. vii. 13 41, 123, 189, 211, 346, 351, „ „ „ 513, 575
Rom. vii. 14 98, 407*, 618
Rom. vii. 15 160
Rom. vii. 17 152, 618*
Rom. vii. 18 320, 530
Rom. vii. 19 160, 528
Rom. vii. 20 618
Rom. vii. 21 59, 149, 534, 557*, 571*
Rom. vii. 22 401, 433
Rom. vii. 24 37, 189*, 197, 237*, 286*, 634
Rom. vii. 25 62, 221, 378, 601*

Rom. viii. 1 135*, 390, 445
Rom. viii. 2 126, 137*, 197
Rom. viii. 3 231*, 235*, 387*, 534, 574*, 624
Rom. viii. 4 57, 58, 134, 420, 477, 482, 582
Rom. viii. 5 56, 402, 447, 453
Rom. viii. 6 453*
Rom. viii. 7 397, 594
Rom. viii. 8 452*
Rom. viii. 9 57, 122, 195, 448, 477, 478
Rom. viii. 10 120
Rom. viii. 11 292, 363, 399
Rom. viii. 12 209, 326*, 445, 556*
Rom. viii. 14 122
Rom. viii. 15 387, 397, 521, 609
Rom. viii. 16 122
Rom. viii. 17 441, 459, 460, 585
Rom. viii. 18 213*, 321, 334, 405*, 550
Rom. viii. 20 58, 399*, 485
Rom. viii. 21 197, 531, 621
Rom. viii. 22 124, 610
Rom. viii. 23 117*, 150, 187*, 528, 531* „ „ „ 583, 637
Rom. viii. 24 216, 284*, 340, 437*
Rom. viii. 25 292, 379, 423, 543
Rom. viii. 26 97, 109, 112, 168, 299*, 433
Rom. viii. 27 122, 400*, 584
Rom. viii. 28 120, 534
Rom. viii. 29 158, 195, 228, 561
Rom. viii. 30 277*, 278
Rom. viii. 31 382, 383, 584
Rom. viii. 32 90, 154, 379, 560
Rom. viii. 33 60, 180, 203, 234, 350, 382, „ „ „ 431, 508, 513
Rom. viii. 34 382
Rom. viii. 35 185, 197, 440
Rom. viii. 36 188, 562
Rom. viii. 38 488
Rom. viii. 39 133

Rom. ix. 1 248*, 390*, 537, 540, 562
Rom. ix. 2 639
Rom. ix. 3 32, 71, 135, 283*, 370, 382, 621
Rom. ix. 4 177*, 520
Rom. ix. 5 60, 230, 375, 401, 551*, 586*
Rom. ix. 6 160, 171, 271, 339*, 597*
Rom. ix. 7 40, 575
Rom. ix. 8 110, 160, 228, 514
Rom. ix. 10 583*
Rom. ix. 11 131, 193*, 425, 441, 459, 484, „ „ „ 561, 562, 589*
Rom. ix. 12 245, 583
Rom. ix. 13 113, 549
Rom. ix. 14 395, 500
Rom. ix. 15 66, 88, 221
Rom. ix. 16 85, 445, 598*
Rom. ix. 17 82, 143, 254
Rom. ix. 18 85, 588
Rom. ix. 19 274*, 280*, 588
Rom. ix. 20 183, 465*, 511, 549, 559
Rom. ix. 21 105, 112, 191, 366, 397, 550
Rom. ix. 22 108, 235, 570*, 599
Rom. ix. 23 409, 570*
Rom. ix. 24 528, 627
Rom. ix. 25 385, 476, 485
Rom. ix. 26 615
Rom. ix. 27 383
Rom. ix. 29 304, 602, 605
Rom. ix. 30 139, 186, 443
Rom. ix. 31 90, 636*
Rom. ix. 32 582, 617*

Rom. ix. 33 233, 435

Rom. x. 1 133, 383, 412, 537, 575*, 586
Rom. x. 2 185*, 212, 403*, 447
Rom. x. 3 186*, 447, 575*
Rom. x. 4 123, 447
Rom. x. 5 133, 447
Rom. x. 6 136, 186
Rom. x. 7 318
Rom. x. 8 195
Rom. x. 10 120, 396, 611, 639
Rom. x. 12 397
Rom. x. 14 199, 82, 158*, 166, 279*, 285*, „ „ „ 480, 632
Rom. x. 15 118, 477, 606
Rom. x. 16 171
Rom. x. 17 123, 367, 411, 445, 558
Rom. x. 18 111, 147*, 511*, 559
Rom. x. 19 114*, 392, 393, 442, 464*, „ „ „ 476*, 511, 528
Rom. x. 20 219, 469*
Rom. x. 21 405

Rom. xi. 1 448, 511
Rom. xi. 2 382, 385
Rom. xi. 4 179*
Rom. xi. 6 283*, 480, 582, 618*
Rom. xi. 7 200
Rom. xi. 8 94
Rom. xi. 10 63
Rom. xi. 11 458, 459, 586
Rom. xi. 12 639
Rom. xi. 13 192*, 408*, 409, 551, 575*
Rom. xi. 15 521
Rom. xi. 16 582*, 584, 585
Rom. xi. 17 200, 292, 391*, 637, 638
Rom. xi. 18 76, 292, 431*, 470, 501, 619*
Rom. xi. 19 118, 280*
Rom. xi. 20 216*, 313*
Rom. xi. 21 193*, 401, 425, 448, 474*, „ „ „ 478, 504*, 598*
Rom. xi. 22 363, 578
Rom. xi. 23 620*
Rom. xi. 24 154, 429, 430
Rom. xi. 25 42, 211, 287, 423*, 477
Rom. xi. 26 428
Rom. xi. 27 131, 193*, 308
Rom. xi. 28 401
Rom. xi. 30 216, 440
Rom. xi. 31 60, 153*, 459*, 550
Rom. xi. 32 178, 397*, 459, 610, 622
Rom. xi. 33 191*, 519, 639
Rom. xi. 35 436
Rom. xi. 36 108, 379*, 418*

Rom. xii. 1 58, 231, 332, 381*, 533*
Rom. xii. 2 519, 578
Rom. xii. 3 400, 404, 433, 481, 550, 638
Rom. xii. 4 548
Rom. xii. 5 110, 249
Rom. xii. 6 352, 440, 545, 578*, 582
Rom. xii. 7 545, 578*
Rom. xii. 8 545
Rom. xii. 9 537, 585, 586*
Rom. xii. 10 215
Rom. xii. 11 476
Rom. xii. 12 210, 217*, 433
Rom. xii. 14 537
Rom. xii. 15 376
Rom. xii. 16 219, 395*, 397, 537, 580
Rom. xii. 18 230, 585
Rom. xii. 19 594
Rom. xii. 20 77, 293, 313*, 444, 580
Rom. xii. 21 537

Rom. xiii. 1 122, 156*, 363, 370, 371, „ „ „ 537, 582*
Rom. xiii. 2 212, 274, 301, 429
Rom. xiii. 3 313, 368, 481, 524
Rom. xiii. 4 192, 293
Rom. xiii. 5 319, 585
Rom. xiii. 6 317, 631*
Rom. xiii. 7 590*
Rom. xiii. 8 47, 123, 209, 273, 323, 499, 501*
Rom. xiii. 9 87, 109, 151, 316, 502, 565
Rom. xiii. 11 195, 239, 319, 366*, 551, „ „ „ 565*, 573*, 585
Rom. xiii. 13 219, 477
Rom. xiii. 14 396, 397, 417, 549, 556*

Rom. xiv. 1 174, 397, 476
Rom. xiv. 2 105, 322*
Rom. xiv. 3 482
Rom. xiv. 4 152, 154, 210
Rom. xiv. 5 154, 404*
Rom. xiv. 6 212
Rom. xiv. 7 441
Rom. xiv. 8 295*
Rom. xiv. 9 161, 206, 276, 457, 552*
Rom. xiv. 10 440
Rom. xiv. 11 209, 449, 457*
Rom. xiv. 13 323, 502, 529, 619
Rom. xiv. 14 152, 160, 390*, 609
Rom. xiv. 15 383, 402, 619
Rom. xiv. 16 155, 502
Rom. xiv. 17 139, 390*, 552

Rom. xiv. 19 133
Rom. xiv. 20 380, 443
Rom. xiv. 21 65, 158, 198, 320, 475*, 488
,, ,, ,, 583*, 584
Rom. xiv. 22 159, 386, 483, 508, 585
Rom. xiv. 23 262, 273*, 293, 582

Rom. xv. 1 476
Rom. xv. 2 397
Rom. xv. 3 74, 118, 222, 448, 574*, 599
Rom. xv. 4 153*, 189*
Rom. xv. 5 78, 185, 286, 321, 401
Rom. xv. 6 388
Rom. xv. 7 118, 122
Rom. xv. 8 122, 153, 185, 334, 383
Rom. xv. 9 322*, 332*, 383
Rom. xv. 11 314
Rom. xv. 12 206, 233
Rom. xv. 13 185, 201, 410
Rom. xv. 14 201, 373
Rom. xv. 15 243*, 278, 379, 399*, 455, 617*
Rom. xv. 16 223*, 455, 531
Rom. xv. 17 230, 390, 455*
Rom. xv. 18 158, 166, 216, 217, 279,
,, ,, ,, 498, 552
Rom. xv. 19 65, 118, 334
Rom. xv. 20 556*, 615
Rom. xv. 21 82, 575, 599
Rom. xv. 22 268, 325, 604
Rom. xv. 23 324, 326, 483
Rom. xv. 24 198, 201, 308*, 321, 331, 472*
Rom. xv. 25 265, 342*
Rom. xv. 26 133, 256
Rom. xv. 27 200, 209, 292, 448
Rom. xv. 28 343, 378*, 385, 621
Rom. xv. 29 384
Rom. xv. 30 332, 381
Rom. xv. 31 133, 234
Rom. xv. 32 122
Rom. xv. 33 585

Rom. xvi. 1 133, 134, 343
Rom. xvi. 2 159, 234, 307, 390, 448, 638
Rom. xvi. 3 136
Rom. xvi. 4 562, 566*
Rom. xvi. 5 185, 397
Rom. xvi. 7 143, 372
Rom. xvi. 8 103, 113, 136
Rom. xvi. 10 136, 190*
Rom. xvi. 11 66, 190*, 390
Rom. xvi. 12 390*
Rom. xvi. 13 155
Rom. xvi. 14 103
Rom. xvi. 15 103
Rom. xvi. 16 118
Rom. xvi. 17 126, 251, 314, 332, 404, 429
Rom. xvi 18 447
Rom. xvi. 19 283, 397
Rom. xvi. 20 280*, 621
Rom. xvi. 22 390, 521
Rom. xvi. 25 218, 401, 545, 567*
Rom. xvi. 26 186, 396, 435, 567*
Rom. xvi. 27 108, 168, 378, 545, 567*

1 Cor. i. 2 263*, 234, 530
1 Cor. i. 3 122, 124
1 Cor. i. 4 393, 412
1 Cor. i. 5 201, 566
1 Cor. i. 6 118, 185*, 566
1 Cor. i. 7 134, 201, 480, 499
1 Cor. i. 8 144, 157*, 417*, 438, 528,
,, ,, ,, 566*, 624
1 Cor. i. 9 378, 585
1 Cor. i. 10 62, 336, 381*, 611
1 Cor. i. 11 65, 190*
1 Cor. i. 12 60, 153, 161, 195, 625*
1 Cor. i. 13 60, 118, 508
1 Cor. i. 15 301
1 Cor. i. 16 60, 298, 443
1 Cor. i. 17 118, 318, 496
1 Cor. i. 18 131, 185, 211, 217
1 Cor. i. 19 83
1 Cor. i. 20 75, 609
1 Cor. i. 21 144, 381*
1 Cor. i. 22 612*
1 Cor. i. 23 135, 441, 541, 612, 638
1 Cor. i. 25 235, 239, 245*
1 Cor. i. 26 317, 585
1 Cor. i. 27 108, 178, 189*, 609
1 Cor. i. 28 129, 178, 484*
1 Cor. i. 29 171, 477
1 Cor. i. 30 122, 371*, 439, 542, 550
1 Cor. i. 31 599*

1 Cor. ii. 1 185, 342, 402, 607
1 Cor. ii. 3 152, 420
1 Cor. ii. 4 96, 126, 611
1 Cor. ii. 5 420, 586
1 Cor. ii. 6 218*, 385, 443
1 Cor. ii. 7 137, 167, 193, 387
1 Cor. ii. 8 304, 562
1 Cor. ii. 9 168, 317, 575, 599, 620, 633*
1 Cor. ii. 10 599*
1 Cor. ii. 11 133, 271, 550, 551
1 Cor. ii. 12 193*, 259
1 Cor. ii. 13 194*, 637

1 Cor. ii. 14 116
1 Cor. ii. 15 116, 559
1 Cor. ii. 16 125, 300

1 Cor. iii. 1 46, 70, 98, 217, 583, 594
1 Cor. iii. 2 70, 226, 493*, 520, 594, 622*
1 Cor. iii. 3 99, 447
1 Cor. iii. 4 62, 308, 447
1 Cor. iii. 5 378, 437, 442, 447, 455*, 550
1 Cor. iii. 6 247
1 Cor. iii. 7 583
1 Cor. iii. 8 128
1 Cor. iii. 9 192
1 Cor. iii. 10 298, 300*
1 Cor. iii. 11 404*
1 Cor. iii. 12 430, 520
1 Cor. iii. 13 265, 388, 457*
1 Cor. iii. 14 53
1 Cor. iii. 15 87, 150, 378, 443
1 Cor. iii. 16 122
1 Cor. iii. 17 166, 539, 638
1 Cor. iii. 18 253, 287, 410, 613
1 Cor. iii. 19 352*, 395
1 Cor. iii. 20 626
1 Cor. iii. 21 195, 233, 301, 575

1 Cor. iv. 1 161, 527
1 Cor. iv. 2 168, 337, 386, 580, 616
1 Cor. iv. 3 184*, 211, 337, 420, 460, 635
1 Cor. iv. 4 271, 350, 387*, 447*, 630
1 Cor. iv. 5 108, 124, 371
1 Cor. iv. 6 62, 173, 289*, 323, 382*, 386*
,, ,, ,, 516, 580, 590*
1 Cor. iv. 7 76, 443, 452* 484
1 Cor. iv. 8 302*, 538, 609
1 Cor. iv. 9 127*, 228, 446, 453, 517, 528
1 Cor. iv. 10 411
1 Cor. iv. 11 92
1 Cor. iv. 13 530
1 Cor. iv. 14 125, 278, 342, 485, 573, 578*
1 Cor. iv. 15 442*
1 Cor. iv. 16 545
1 Cor. iv. 17 133, 166, 167*, 226
1 Cor. iv. 18 278, 484, 617
1 Cor. iv. 20 586
1 Cor. iv. 21 285, 384, 420

1 Cor. v. 1 384, 480, 550*, 615
1 Cor. v. 2 315, 429, 436*, 508
1 Cor. v. 3 160, 453*, 575
1 Cor. v. 4 391, 562
1 Cor. v. 5 160, 459*
1 Cor. v. 6 524
1 Cor. v. 7 44, 284, 448, 524, 528, 534, 538
1 Cor. v. 8 120, 301, 384, 477, 531
1 Cor. v. 9 106, 278, 481, 555*
1 Cor. v. 10 128, 129, 283, 445
1 Cor. v. 11 278*, 481, 572*
1 Cor. v. 12 211, 586
1 Cor. v. 13 313, 438, 538

1 Cor. vi. 1 254*, 375, 613
1 Cor. vi. 2 234, 292, 385, 638
1 Cor. vi. 3 124*
1 Cor. vi. 4 60, 160, 317, 550, 561
1 Cor. vi. 5 80, 173, 175*, 300, 398
1 Cor. vi. 6 214, 442, 451
1 Cor. vi. 7 214, 254*
1 Cor. vi. 10 488, 500*
1 Cor. vi. 11 41, 142, 162*, 255, 442, 513,
,, ,, ,, 529, 609, 625
1 Cor. vi. 12 369
1 Cor. vi. 13 211, 586
1 Cor. vi. 14 378
1 Cor. vi. 15 47, 118, 192, 608
1 Cor. vi. 16 183, 522*
1 Cor. vi. 18 223, 233, 310, 538
1 Cor. vi. 19 122, 163, 174, 195*
1 Cor. vi. 20 206, 313, 386, 595*

1 Cor. vii. 1 57, 159, 166, 320
1 Cor. vii. 2 154*, 176, 398*
1 Cor. vii. 3 106, 571, 582
1 Cor. vii. 4 495, 538
1 Cor. vii. 5 303*, 424*
1 Cor. vii. 7 283*, 368, 440, 452*, 465*
,, ,, ,, 528, 603
1 Cor. vii. 8 320
1 Cor. vii. 9 77, 84, 292, 477
1 Cor. vii. 10 197, 321, 496*
1 Cor. vii. 11 262, 293, 565
1 Cor. vii. 12 152, 496*, 502, 520
1 Cor. vii. 13 150, 502, 577
1 Cor. vii. 14 132, 271, 283*, 389*, 445
1 Cor. vii. 15 311*, 386, 417, 518, 538
1 Cor. vii. 16 85, 299
1 Cor. vii. 18 169*
1 Cor. vii. 19 583*
1 Cor. vii. 20 422
1 Cor. vii. 21 541, 582*, 595
1 Cor. vii. 22 124
1 Cor. vii. 23 538, 539
1 Cor. vii. 24 314, 395*
1 Cor. vii. 25 124, 455
1 Cor. vii. 26 106, 320*, 455*, 523, 568, 602
1 Cor. vii. 27 197, 209

1 Cor. vii. 28 84, 205, 211, 277, 284*, 293*
1 Cor. vii. 29 596, 106, 287, 459*, 460, 484
1 Cor. vii. 31 210, 251, 340
1 Cor. vii. 32 299
1 Cor. vii. 33 109, 299
1 Cor. vii. 34 215, 299, 519
1 Cor. vii. 35 211, 329, 354, 430, 464
1 Cor. vii. 36 77, 242, 296, 321, 332, 631*
1 Cor. vii. 37 161, 193*, 483, 573*
1 Cor. vii. 38 242, 243, 439*, 576*
1 Cor. vii. 39 84, 158, 159, 319, 390, 584
1 Cor. vii. 40 613

1 Cor. viii. 1 84, 562, 565*
1 Cor. viii. 2 499, 539, 565*, 613
1 Cor. viii. 3 263*, 565*
1 Cor. viii. 4 123, 444, 558, 565
1 Cor. viii. 5 116, 120
1 Cor. viii. 6 149, 419*, 579
1 Cor. viii. 7 185*, 191, 198, 216, 450,
„ „ „ 466, 550
1 Cor. viii. 8 279
1 Cor. viii. 9 211, 452*, 504
1 Cor. viii. 10 134, 263*, 293
1 Cor. viii. 11 394, 446
1 Cor. viii. 12 155
1 Cor. viii. 13 65, 506

1 Cor. ix. 1 510
1 Cor. ix. 2 211, 212, 444, 479*
1 Cor. ix. 3 211
1 Cor. ix. 4 319, 511
1 Cor. ix. 5 228, 257*, 319, 511, 523*, 527
1 Cor. ix. 6 324, 326, 465, 518
1 Cor. ix. 7 198, 199, 216*
1 Cor. ix. 8 402
1 Cor. ix. 9 205, 316, 446, 495, 595*
1 Cor. ix. 10 45, 394, 446
1 Cor. ix. 11 155, 294
1 Cor. ix. 12 185, 200, 209, 582
1 Cor. ix. 13 84, 108, 433
1 Cor. ix. 14 367
1 Cor. ix. 15 162, 209, 218, 239, 276, 278,
„ „ „ 337*, 386*, 550, 572
1 Cor. ix. 16 293, 430, 447
1 Cor. ix. 17 229, 260, 292, 465, 528,
„ „ „ 541, 620
1 Cor. ix. 18 108, 137, 329
1 Cor. ix. 19 87, 242, 257, 341*, 344
1 Cor. ix. 20 87, 123, 278*
1 Cor. ix. 21 87, 483, 484, 562
1 Cor. ix. 22 170
1 Cor. ix. 24 313, 598
1 Cor. ix. 25 111, 227, 582
1 Cor. ix. 26 474, 484, 485*
1 Cor. ix. 27 43, 502

1 Cor. x. 1 106, 407, 476*, 549, 609
1 Cor. x. 2 67, 255*
1 Cor. x. 3 133, 198
1 Cor. x. 4 114, 118, 199, 268*, 281, 525
1 Cor. x. 5 71, 232
1 Cor. x. 6 175, 329*, 527
1 Cor. x. 7 318
1 Cor. x. 8 74, 250, 502
1 Cor. x. 9 143*, 369
1 Cor. x. 10 106
1 Cor. x. 11 175, 405, 452*, 515, 527, 550
1 Cor. x. 12 78, 301, 504, 613*
1 Cor. x. 13 324, 325, 585, 590*, 594*
1 Cor. x. 14 223*, 313
1 Cor. x. 16 118, 164, 189*, 237, 628
1 Cor. x. 17 110, 201, 368
1 Cor. x. 18 114, 135*, 200
1 Cor. x. 19 53
1 Cor. x. 20 442, 520
1 Cor. x. 21 124, 125, 189*, 200
1 Cor. x. 22 284*
1 Cor. x. 23 495
1 Cor. x. 24 496, 583
1 Cor. x. 25 313
1 Cor. x. 27 550, 593*, 614*
1 Cor. x. 28 421
1 Cor. x. 29 150
1 Cor. x. 30 159, 216
1 Cor. x. 32 439
1 Cor. x. 33 483*

1 Cor. xi. 1 582*
1 Cor. xi. 2 205, 227, 453*
1 Cor. xi. 3 114, 118, 122
1 Cor. xi. 4 111, 344*, 381*, 411, 544, 594
1 Cor. xi. 5 108, 150, 178, 216*
1 Cor. xi. 6 311*, 320, 437*, 478*
1 Cor. xi. 7 122, 513
1 Cor. xi. 8 447
1 Cor. xi. 9 409
1 Cor. xi. 10 374, 411
1 Cor. xi. 12 381*, 409
1 Cor. xi. 13 319, 433
1 Cor. xi. 15 271*, 364*
1 Cor. xi. 16 582, 613*, 619
1 Cor. xi. 17 396, 420
1 Cor. xi. 18 274*, 347, 413, 414*, 575, 576*
1 Cor. xi. 20 319, 320*, 444, 576
1 Cor. xi. 21 77, 105

1 Cor. xi. 22 86, 174, 285, 447, 511, 552, 594*
,, ,, ,,
1 Cor. xi. 23 116, 139, 144, 153, 270, 370* 432, 438, 582
,, ,, ,,
1 Cor. xi. 24 153
1 Cor. xi. 25 308*, 386, 403*, 582
1 Cor. xi. 26 42, 297, 308*, 317*, 454*
1 Cor. xi. 27 202, 301, 441*
1 Cor. xi. 28 199, 452*
1 Cor. xi. 29 343, 552, 638
1 Cor. xi. 30 267*, 274, 527
1 Cor. xi. 31 150, 253, 304, 638
1 Cor. xi. 32 391
1 Cor. xi. 34 308*

1 Cor. xii. 1 373
1 Cor. xii. 2 132, 306, 457, 526, 571, 636
1 Cor. xii. 3 122, 390*
1 Cor. xii. 4 437, 540
1 Cor. xii. 5 437
1 Cor. xii. 6 258, 437
1 Cor. xii. 7 405
1 Cor. xii. 8 105, 378, 401, 411, 419*
1 Cor. xii. 9 419*
1 Cor. xii. 12 548, 606
1 Cor. xii. 13 229, 440, 552, 621
1 Cor. xii. 15 368*, 404*, 498*
1 Cor. xii. 16 404*
1 Cor. xii. 19 304
1 Cor. xii. 22 240, 245, 528, 549, 550
1 Cor. xii. 23 240
1 Cor. xii. 27 125, 424*
1 Cor. xii. 28 105, 568*
1 Cor. xii. 31 132, 242, 265, 464, 466*

1 Cor. xiii. 1 273, 292, 440, 441, 549
1 Cor. xiii. 2 44, 527, 610
1 Cor. xiii. 3 75, 226*, 289
1 Cor. xiii. 4 520, 538
1 Cor. xiii. 5 520, 538
1 Cor. xiii. 6 210, 232, 433, 520, 538
1 Cor. xiii. 7 520, 538
1 Cor. xiii. 8 520, 538, 585
1 Cor. xiii. 10 109
1 Cor. xiii. 11 80, 268, 270, 296, 609
1 Cor. xiii. 12 153*, 263*, 377, 380*, 404*
1 Cor. xiii. 13 240*, 242*

1 Cor. xiv. 1 453*, 577*
1 Cor. xiv. 2 549
1 Cor. xiv. 4 122, 150
1 Cor. xiv. 5 294*, 129, 239, 577, 605*
1 Cor. xiv. 6 387, 420, 440, 612
1 Cor. xiv. 7 54, 129, 134, 279, 344*, 444, 553*
,, ,, ,,
1 Cor. xiv. 8 253
1 Cor. xiv. 9 349, 378, 446, 561
1 Cor. xiv. 10 123, 638
1 Cor. xiv. 11 217, 218*, 385, 387*, 444 577
1 Cor. xiv. 13 460*
1 Cor. xiv. 15 62, 279*, 285
1 Cor. xiv. 16 108, 279, 480
1 Cor. xiv. 18 345*, 627
1 Cor. xiv. 19 62, 122, 241, 389
1 Cor. xiv. 20 215*
1 Cor. xiv. 22 184, 211, 212, 301, 496
1 Cor. xiv. 23 496, 510
1 Cor. xiv. 24 518, 609
1 Cor. xiv. 25 122, 515
1 Cor. xiv. 26 520, 538, 625
1 Cor. xiv. 27 401*, 582*
1 Cor. xiv. 30 244
1 Cor. xiv. 31 249
1 Cor. xiv. 33 196
1 Cor. xiv. 34 229, 622
1 Cor. xiv. 35 122, 320, 333
1 Cor xiv. 36 396
1 Cor. xiv. 37 168, 278, 613, 626
1 Cor. xiv. 38 311*
1 Cor. xiv. 39 323

1 Cor. xv. 1 71, 438
1 Cor. xv. 2 265, 561, 605
1 Cor. xv. 3 412
1 Cor. xv. 4 272*, 281
1 Cor. xv. 6 250
1 Cor. xv. 8 46, 53, 106, 171
1 Cor. xv. 9 337, 565, 615*
1 Cor. xv. 11 518
1 Cor. xv. 12 123, 626
1 Cor. xv. 13 123, 452*, 478*
1 Cor. xv. 14 452*
1 Cor. xv. 15 123, 185, 382, 445
1 Cor. xv. 16 292*, 478
1 Cor. xv. 18 135, 390*
1 Cor. xv. 19 233, 242
1 Cor. xv. 20 123, 527, 530
1 Cor. xv. 21 123, 586*, 610
1 Cor. xv. 22 389, 421, 440
1 Cor. xv. 23 527
1 Cor. xv. 24 124, 308
1 Cor. xv. 25 297, 332, 523*, 588*, 589
1 Cor. xv. 26 527
1 Cor. xv. 27 272, 308, 522, 582, 585, 588
1 Cor. xv. 28 112, 114
1 Cor. xv. 29 123, 175, 279*, 382*, 480

1 Cor. xv. 31 153*, 517
1 Cor. xv. 32 108, 123, 285, 585
1 Cor. xv. 33 41, 640*
1 Cor. xv. 34 312*, 314
1 Cor. xv. 35 266*, 280*, 442, 443
1 Cor. xv. 36 158, 183
1 Cor. xv. 37 294*, 340, 621
1 Cor. xv. 38 437
1 Cor. xv. 39 171
1 Cor. xv. 40 586
1 Cor. xv. 41 120, 196, 217, 562
1 Cor. xv. 42 123, 266, 522
1 Cor. xv. 43 538
1 Cor. xv. 44 549
1 Cor. xv. 46 234, 592*
1 Cor. xv. 47 59
1 Cor. xv. 49 78, 277*
1 Cor. xv. 50 161, 518, 596
1 Cor. xv. 51 555*
1 Cor. xv. 52 89,123,385*,436,522*,555*
1 Cor. xv. 53 331
1 Cor. xv. 54 541, 606, 621, 639
1 Cor. xv. 56 114
1 Cor. xv. 57 340, 341
1 Cor. xv. 58 344

1 Cor. xvi. 1 133, 313, 373*, 397
1 Cor. xvi. 2 248, 307, 395, 401, 541
1 Cor. xvi. 3 60, 176*, 308, 310, 318, ,, ,, ,, 380*, 543
1 Cor. xvi. 4 324*
1 Cor. xvi. 5 446, 562*
1 Cor. xvi. 6 159, 355*, 405, 440
1 Cor. xvi. 7 283, 331
1 Cor. xvi. 9 437*, 585
1 Cor. xvi. 10 124
1 Cor. xvi. 12 62, 336, 373, 554
1 Cor. xvi. 13 313
1 Cor. xvi. 15 60, 125, 185, 515, 626
1 Cor. xvi. 17 153*
1 Cor. xvi. 21 529*, 531
1 Cor. xvi. 22 79, 479*

2 Cor. i. 2 122, 139
2 Cor. i. 3 551, 586
2 Cor. i. 4 163
2 Cor. i. 5 189*, 378
2 Cor. i 6 136, 155, 383, 527, 582*
2 Cor. i. 7 440, 572
2 Cor. i. 8 83, 324, 383, 403
2 Cor. i. 9 233, 123, 150, 214, 410, 459
2 Cor. i. 10 233, 273
2 Cor. i. 11 222*, 412
2 Cor. i. 12 70, 98, 122, 243, 247*, 420
2 Cor. i. 13 442*
2 Cor. i. 14 423*, 513
2 Cor. i. 15 216, 283*
2 Cor. i. 16 431
2 Cor. i. 17 109, 395, 445, 460*, 476, 513
2 Cor. i. 18 449, 476, 585
2 Cor. i. 19 272, 476, 558
2 Cor. i. 21 521, 584
2 Cor. i. 22 417
2 Cor. i. 23 340, 619
2 Cor. i. 24 206, 210, 555, 597

2 Cor. ii. 1 161, 212, 323, 386, 482, 529
2 Cor. ii. 2 108, 367, 368, 437
2 Cor. ii. 3 159, 208, 278, 282, 409, 410
2 Cor. ii. 4 243, 278, 366, 379*, 550
2 Cor. ii. 5 292, 497
2 Cor. ii. 6 133, 209, 517*
2 Cor. ii. 7 46, 323, 502
2 Cor. ii. 8 120, 332
2 Cor. ii. 9 161, 278
2 Cor. ii. 10 261, 264*, 448
2 Cor. ii. 12 145, 397*, 443, 453*
2 Cor. ii. 13 145, 211*, 328*, 475
2 Cor. ii. 14 23, 251, 389
2 Cor. ii. 16 397, 584, 610*
2 Cor. ii. 17 110

2 Cor. iii. 1 87, 200, 508, 614
2 Cor. iii. 2 114, 134, 430, 431, 513, 638
2 Cor. iii. 3 98*, 384, 420
2 Cor. iii. 4 555*
2 Cor. iii. 5 319, 367, 411, 597
2 Cor. iii 6 83, 191*, 228, 438, 527
2 Cor. iii. 7 341, 480, 634, 635*
2 Cor. iii. 8 280*
2 Cor. iii. 9 236, 455*
2 Cor. iii. 10 43, 271
2 Cor. iii. 11 379, 411*, 424, 425
2 Cor iii. 12 111
2 Cor. iii. 13 329, 582*
2 Cor. iii. 14 46, 534*, 565
2 Cor. iii. 15 296, 408, 565, 590
2 Cor. iii. 16 40, 308*, 565
2 Cor. iii. 17 114, 565
2 Cor. iii. 18 124, 174, 229, 254*, 370, ,, ,, ,, 419, 565

2 Cor. iv. 1 565*
2 Cor. iv. 2 41, 85, 87, 253*, 386, 405, 488
2 Cor. iv. 3 218*

2 Cor. iv. 4 118, 190, 329, 482, 624*
2 Cor. iv. 5 399
2 Cor. iv. 6 168, 367*
2 Cor. iv. 7 195*, 236, 412, 460*
2 Cor. iv. 8 355, 485, 520, 638
2 Cor. iv. 9 355, 485
2 Cor. iv. 10 189, 355
2 Cor. iv. 11 123, 213, 446, 522
2 Cor. iv. 12 301
2 Cor. iv. 13 112, 351*, 401
2 Cor. iv. 15 586
2 Cor. iv. 16 155, 442, 463*
2 Cor. iv. 17 235, 396, 411, 635*
2 Cor. iv. 18 208*, 484*

2 Cor. v. 1 122, 155, 191, 266*, 293, 524, ,, ,, ,, 528, 531
2 Cor. v. 2 147*, 353*
2 Cor. v. 3 560, 616
2 Cor. v. 4 83, 107*, 353, 394, 448, 459, ,, ,, ,, 638
2 Cor. v. 5 531*
2 Cor. v. 6 352*, 430, 562, 573*
2 Cor. v. 7 41, 120, 379, 565
2 Cor. v. 8 443, 562
2 Cor. v. 10 159, 405
2 Cor. v. 11 186, 331*, 334
2 Cor. v. 12 41, 87, 352*, 594
2 Cor. v. 13 212, 582
2 Cor. v. 14 185
2 Cor. v. 15 161, 383, 445, 477, 558
2 Cor. v. 16 292, 301
2 Cor. v. 17 235, 390
2 Cor. v. 18 209
2 Cor. v. 19 145, 349, 618*
2 Cor. v. 20 262, 383*
2 Cor. v. 21 186, 382, 484*, 638

2 Cor. vi. 1 332
2 Cor. vi. 2 522, 565, 609
2 Cor. vi. 3 483, 484*, 499
2 Cor. vi. 4 78, 87, 181*, 389
2 Cor. vi. 6 389
2 Cor. vi. 7 132, 378, 389, 552
2 Cor. vi. 8 389
2 Cor. vi. 9 573
2 Cor. vi. 11 271
2 Cor. vi. 12 388
2 Cor. vi. 13 530*, 620*
2 Cor. vi. 14 211, 221*, 350, 406, 584
2 Cor. vi. 15 41, 234, 443
2 Cor. vi. 16 430
2 Cor. vi. 17 74, 147*, 201

2 Cor. vii. 1 186, 197, 344, 544
2 Cor. vii. 2 538, 609
2 Cor. vii. 3 49, 329
2 Cor. vii. 4 217, 383
2 Cor. vii. 5 352*, 568, 572
2 Cor. vii. 6 528, 534
2 Cor. vii. 7 135, 234, 243*, 584
2 Cor. vii. 8 584, 612
2 Cor. vii. 9 397, 402*, 460*, 477, 496*
2 Cor. vii. 10 402*
2 Cor. vii. 11 161, 216*, 320
2 Cor. vii. 12 43, 133, 278, 329, 354, 405, ,, ,, ,, 582, 601
2 Cor. vii. 13 240, 243, 371, 393*
2 Cor. vii. 14 227, 233, 292, 375*
2 Cor. vii. 15 205, 377
2 Cor. vii. 16 410

2 Cor. viii. 1 218
2 Cor. viii. 2 381*, 386, 425
2 Cor. viii. 3 562, 571*
2 Cor. viii. 4 133, 155, 198, 631
2 Cor. viii. 5 122, 572, 576*, 584*
2 Cor. viii. 6 288, 329*
2 Cor. viii. 7 193*, 315, 450, 451*
2 Cor. viii. 8 381*
2 Cor. viii. 9 157, 341
2 Cor. viii. 10 323, 422, 480, 560*
2 Cor. viii. 11 313, 324, 368, 560*, 585
2 Cor. viii. 12 307*
2 Cor. viii. 13 424*, 585, 586
2 Cor. viii. 15 589*
2 Cor. viii. 16 414, 585
2 Cor. viii. 17 242*, 443
2 Cor. viii. 18 278, 378, 433
2 Cor. viii. 19 391, 583
2 Cor. viii. 20 53, 351*
2 Cor. viii. 22 240, 637
2 Cor. viii. 23 383, 578, 585
2 Cor. viii. 24 174, 397, 602

2 Cor. ix. 1 133, 447*, 576
2 Cor. ix. 2 65, 193*, 208, 222, 233, 272, ,, ,, ,, 383, 422, 629
2 Cor. ix. 3 576
2 Cor. ix. 5 318, 336
2 Cor. ix. 6 176, 392*, 394, 596*
2 Cor. ix. 7 446, 587*
2 Cor. ix. 8 637
2 Cor. ix. 9 469*, 588
2 Cor. ix. 10 286, 572
2 Cor. ix. 11 211, 572
2 Cor. ix. 12 211, 572

2 Cor. ix. 13 118, 136, 186, 381*, 572*
2 Cor. ix. 14 204, 217
2 Cor. ix. 15 393, 585

2 Cor. x. 1 381, 397, 521, 558
2 Cor. x. 2 259, 321, 322*, 409, 443, 482
„ „ „ 527, 602
2 Cor. x. 3 411, 638
2 Cor. x. 4 212, 248, 565
2 Cor. x. 5 186, 621
2 Cor. x. 6 332
2 Cor. x. 7 122, 161, 195, 372*, 585
2 Cor. x. 9 310*
2 Cor. x. 10 522*, 563
2 Cor. x. 11 161
2 Cor. x. 12 81, 87, 150, 209, 218*, 331, 637
2 Cor. x. 13 163, 165, 318, 396, 530
2 Cor. x. 14 90, 342*, 384, 396, 431,
„ „ „ 474*, 484
2 Cor. x. 15 331
2 Cor. x. 16 109, 318, 587
2 Cor. x. 18 78, 87

2 Cor. xi. 1 72, 302*, 442
2 Cor. xi. 2 117, 185, 258, 318, 534
2 Cor. xi. 3 133, 370, 504, 541, 621
2 Cor. xi. 4 72, 109, 306*
2 Cor. xi. 5 196*, 422, 446
2 Cor. xi. 6 398*, 442, 580, 585*
2 Cor. xi. 7 208, 509*
2 Cor. xi. 8 44, 405, 499
2 Cor. xi. 9 134*
2 Cor. xi. 10 248*, 397, 449, 456*
2 Cor. xi. 11 582
2 Cor. xi. 12 158, 286
2 Cor. xi. 13 111, 513
2 Cor. xi. 14 112
2 Cor. xi. 16 321, 583, 584, 605
2 Cor. xi. 17 401
2 Cor. xi. 18 117, 233
2 Cor. xi. 20 255*, 609
2 Cor. xi. 21 40, 402*, 563, 618
2 Cor. xi. 22 454
2 Cor. xi. 23 176, 217, 243, 423*, 466, 578*
2 Cor. xi. 24 369, 578, 589
2 Cor. xi. 25 74, 272*
2 Cor. xi. 26 188*, 217, 573, 609
2 Cor. xi. 27 578
2 Cor. xi. 28 533*
2 Cor. xi. 29 153*
2 Cor. xi. 30 222, 538
2 Cor. xi. 32 60, 61, 138
2 Cor. xi. 33 429, 606

2 Cor. xii. 1 124, 177, 454*
2 Cor. xii. 2 83, 121, 126, 160, 176, 372,
„ „ „ 417, 565
2 Cor. xii. 3 111, 626
2 Cor. xii. 4 83, 331, 626
2 Cor. xii. 5 383, 454
2 Cor. xii. 6 199, 159, 453*, 502
2 Cor. xii. 7 177, 220*, 550, 561, 611
2 Cor. xii. 8 336, 383, 427
2 Cor. xii. 9 118, 209, 240, 271, 284
2 Cor. xii. 10 232
2 Cor. xii. 11 197, 282*, 422, 477, 538
2 Cor. xii. 12 106, 111*, 410, 575
2 Cor. xii. 13 403*
2 Cor. xii. 14 41, 332, 625
2 Cor. xii. 15 156, 245
2 Cor. xii. 17 158, 574*
2 Cor. xii. 18 219
2 Cor. xii. 19 155, 209, 383*, 508
2 Cor. xii. 20 65, 176, 219, 453*, 504, 556*
2 Cor. xii. 21 163, 207, 222, 343, 393, 482,
„ „ „ 494, 504, 554*, 635*

2 Cor. xiii. 1 250*, 265, 375, 440, 625
2 Cor. xiii. 2 128
2 Cor. xiii. 3 411, 418
2 Cor. xiii. 4 86, 388*, 442, 541
2 Cor. xiii. 5 626
2 Cor. xiii. 7 212, 321, 460*, 495, 513,
„ „ „ 555*, 617
2 Cor. xiii. 8 382, 594
2 Cor. xiii. 9 155, 161, 529
2 Cor. xiii. 10 278, 494

Gal. i. 1 122, 371, 378, 379, 418*
Gal. i. 3 124, 139
Gal. i. 4 133, 383, 412, 525
Gal. i. 5 108
Gal. i. 6 638
Gal. i. 7 109, 118, 513
Gal. i. 8 159, 295, 296, 517, 518*
Gal. i. 10 80, 304, 509
Gal. i. 11 402, 549
Gal. i. 12 489, 492*
Gal. i. 13 269*
Gal. i. 14 70, 243, 403
Gal. i. 15 367
Gal. i. 16 218*, 552
Gal. i. 18 428
Gal. i. 19 113, 633*
Gal. i. 20 449
Gal. i. 22 215, 390
Gal. i. 23 108, 353*, 545, 631*

Gal. i. 24 388

Gal. ii. 1 60, 380*
Gal. ii. 2 353, 380, 443, 504*, 632*
Gal. ii. 4 255, 289, 545, 569*
Gal. ii. 5 236
Gal. ii. 6 170*, 568*
Gal. ii. 7 46, 229, 260*, 271*
Gal. ii. 8 258, 397, 562, 565
Gal. ii. 9 152, 587*, 592, 613
Gal. ii. 10 142, 149*, 550
Gal. ii. 11 343*
Gal. ii. 12 446
Gal. ii. 13 216, 301
Gal. ii. 14 45, 236, 405
Gal. ii. 15 521
Gal. ii. 16 171, 186, 266, 280
Gal. ii. 17 120, 500, 510*, 616*
Gal. ii. 18 87
Gal. ii. 19 210, 428
Gal. ii. 20 168, 227, 619
Gal. ii. 21 123, 558

Gal. iii. 1 75, 83, 135*, 149*, 183, 223
,, ,, ,, 400, 537, 549
Gal. iii. 2 365, 509
Gal. iii. 7 424*, 445
Gal. iii. 8 71, 114, 411
Gal. iii. 9 301, 391
Gal. iii. 10 325, 368, 407
Gal. iii. 11 123, 136, 186
Gal. iii. 13 383
Gal. iii. 14 237*
Gal. iii. 15 192, 402, 444, 553*
Gal. iii. 16 166*, 375, 522
Gal. iii. 17 596, 250, 396
Gal. iii. 18 123, 619
Gal. iii. 19 124, 297, 379*
Gal. iii. 20 116, 593*
Gal. iii. 21 123, 139, 304, 508
Gal. iii. 22 186, 397
Gal. iii. 23 334, 396, 550, 558
Gal. iii. 26 122, 213, 234
Gal. iii. 28 80, 552
Gal. iii. 29 445

Gal. iv. 1 106
Gal. iv. 2 407
Gal. iv. 3 80
Gal. iv. 4 86
Gal. iv. 5 123
Gal. iv. 6 580
Gal. iv. 7 301, 379, 580
Gal. iv. 8 475, 486*
Gal. iv. 9 263*, 604
Gal. iv. 10 253
Gal. iv. 11 503*, 626
Gal. iv. 12 227
Gal. iv. 13 71, 223, 400*
Gal. iv. 15 84, 305, 585
Gal. iv. 17 289*, 638
Gal. iv. 18 320, 329
Gal. iv. 19 141
Gal. iv. 20 283, 330
Gal. iv. 21 407, 537
Gal. iv. 22 173
Gal. iv. 23 104
Gal. iv. 24 118, 248, 562, 576
Gal. iv. 25 109*, 112, 179*
Gal. iv. 26 576
Gal. iv. 27 240, 485*
Gal. iv. 28 192, 402*
Gal. iv. 30 506
Gal. iv. 31 445

Gal. v. 1 210
Gal. v. 2 227, 521
Gal. v. 4 73, 427, 429, 621
Gal. v. 6 120
Gal. v. 7 604
Gal. v. 8 637
Gal. v. 10 137, 214, 321
Gal. v. 11 558
Gal. v. 12 255, 302, 638
Gal. v. 13 394, 596*
Gal. v. 14 109, 151, 549
Gal. v. 16 219, 506
Gal. v. 17 307*, 460
Gal. v. 19 515
Gal. v. 20 65, 176
Gal. v. 21 200
Gal. v. 26 209, 476, 502*

Gal. vi. 1 537, 580, 626
Gal. vi. 3 170*, 613
Gal. vi. 6 110, 114
Gal. vi. 7 310
Gal. vi. 9 483, 502
Gal. vi. 10 284, 448
Gal. vi. 11 278
Gal. vi. 12 216, 290
Gal. vi. 13 233, 287, 332
Gal. vi. 14 123, 319
Gal. vi. 16 437
Gal. vi. 17 153, 207

Eph. i. 3 410, 517, 551, 586
Eph. i. 4 125, 342, 386
Eph. i. 5 342, 378, 402, 611
Eph. i. 6 125, 163, 190
Eph. i. 7 389*, 528
Eph. i. 8 111*, 163, 164*
Eph. i. 9 152, 342
Eph. i. 10 397, 528
Eph. i. 11 258, 262
Eph. i. 12 58, 125, 134*
Eph. i. 13 213, 216, 528, 562, 586*
Eph. i. 14 166, 410, 531
Eph. i. 15 133, 135, 137, 154*, 234
Eph. i. 16 256, 376, 383, 412
Eph. i. 17 78, 152, 290, 416
Eph. i. 18 108, 298, 572, 584
Eph. i. 19 134, 190, 421, 529, 611
Eph. i. 20 125, 218*, 235, 384, 430, 573, 592
Eph. i. 21 420, 421, 527, 566, 615
Eph. i. 23 114, 166, 167*, 258*, 260*, „ „ „ 513, 533, 638

Eph. ii. 1 126, 412, 611
Eph. ii. 2 238*, 401, 634*
Eph. ii. 3 80, 127, 176, 191*, 215*, 238, „ „ „ 386, 410, 550*, 573*
Eph. ii. 4 201*, 225, 399, 443
Eph. ii. 5 218*, 565
Eph. ii. 6 235, 278
Eph. ii. 7 65, 137, 254, 410
Eph. ii. 8 192, 217*, 411, 562
Eph. ii. 9 459, 477
Eph. ii. 10 149*, 155, 163, 192, 386, 394
Eph. ii. 11 135, 313, 562, 566*, 578, 582, 602
Eph. ii. 12 177*, 194, 197, 428, 465, 477, „ „ „ 566, 578
Eph. ii. 13 118, 341, 578
Eph. ii. 14 114, 181, 228, 531
Eph. ii. 15 136, 138, 220*, 386, 388, 528, 621
Eph. ii. 16 342, 416*
Fph. ii. 17 607*, 609
Eph. ii. 19 558
Eph. ii. 20 128, 130, 185, 431
Eph. ii. 21 83, 111*, 136, 149*, 193, 342, 396
Eph. ii. 22 122, 317

Eph. iii. 1 189, 521, 566*
Eph. iii. 2 448, 560, 634
Eph. iii. 4 136
Eph. iii. 5 128, 218, 221, 566*
Eph. iii. 6 318*, 389
Eph. iii. 8 65, 69, 242, 319, 362
Eph. iii. 10 128, 235*, 362, 459*
Eph. iii. 11 167, 256
Eph. iii. 12 128, 137, 167, 186
Eph. iii. 13 136, 166*, 234, 388
Eph. iii. 14 404, 566*, 638
Eph. iii. 15 111*, 116, 121, 615
Eph. iii. 16 65, 78, 290*, 319, 378, 397, 417*
Eph. iii. 18 128, 144, 331, 340, 572*
Eph. iii. 19 185, 217*, 346*, 638
Eph. iii. 20 158
Eph. iii. 21 108

Eph. iv. 1 136*, 152, 163, 332, 388*, 566*
Eph. iv. 2 202, 572*
Eph. iv. 3 386, 572*
Eph. iv. 4 417, 584
Eph. iv. 6 375, 419*
Eph. iv. 7 401
Eph. iv. 8 225, 522
Eph. iv. 9 69, 243, 531*, 592
Eph. iv. 11 104
Eph. iv. 12 144, 157, 411, 615
Eph. iv. 13 190*, 297, 528
Eph. iv. 14 460*, 477
Eph. iv. 15 397
Eph. iv. 16 256, 386
Eph. iv. 17 161, 514, 526
Eph. iv. 18 186*, 189, 215, 428, 526*
Eph. iv. 19 213
Eph. iv. 21 199*, 391*
Eph. iv. 22 318, 321*, 322*, 342, 347*, „ „ „ 410
Eph. iv. 23 215, 263*, 611
Eph. iv. 25 313, 342, 528
Eph. iv. 26 120, 311*, 313, 494*, 584
Eph. iv. 27 312, 491*
Eph. iv. 28 234, 313, 353*, 501
Eph. iv. 29 172, 363, 583
Eph. iv. 30 125, 396
Eph. iv. 31 312

Eph. v. 2 386, 438, 605*
Eph. v. 3 441, 485*, 615*
Eph. v. 4 270
Eph. v. 5 122, 128, 166, 167, 172*, 265, „ „ „ 355*, 518
Eph. v. 6 501
Eph. v. 8 233
Eph. v. 9 184*, 562, 565
Eph. v. 11 143, 521
Eph. v. 12 47, 141, 146*, 319
Eph. v. 13 258*
Eph. v. 14 79, 90, 123, 312, 431
Eph. v. 15 300*, 474*, 610

Eph. v. 17 584, 610
Eph. v. 18 217
Eph. v. 19 212*, 216, 351
Eph. v. 20 351, 383
Eph. v. 21 186, 351*
Eph. v. 22 154, 351
Eph. v. 23 122, 451, 530
Eph. v. 24 440, 451*, 582*
Eph. v. 26 30, 123, 138*
Eph. v. 27 482, 545, 577
Eph. v. 28 150
Eph. v. 29 278
Eph. v. 31 183, 262, 364*, 432*
Eph. v. 32 153*, 397, 443
Eph. v. 33 249, 315, 577

Eph. vi. 1 182, 390, 537
Eph. vi. 2 126, 316, 391*, 562
Eph. vi. 3 289*
Eph. vi. 4 189*, 313, 388*
Eph. vi. 5 138, 537, 401*
Eph. vi. 6 402
Eph. vi. 8 310, 365, 552, 621
Eph. vi. 9 192
Eph. vi. 10 264, 537
Eph. vi. 11 176, 189*
Eph. vi. 12 235, 239*, 421, 496, 552, 609
Eph. vi. 13 132, 189*, 313
Eph. vi. 14 174, 432, 531
Eph. vi. 15 416
Eph. vi. 16 108, 134*,384, 393, 531
Eph. vi. 17 709, 123, 166, 313
Eph. vi. 18 122, 383, 410, 412, 437, 631
Eph. vi. 20 384*, 386
Eph. vi. 21 126, 136, 401*
Eph. vi. 22 161
Eph. vi. 23 124, 377

Phil. i. 1 136, 587
Phil. i. 2 122
Phil. i. 3 110, 392*, 393
Phil. i. 4 256, 637
Phil. i. 5 109, 124, 126, 193
Phil. i. 6 143, 161, 227
Phil. i. 7 128, 148, 319, 329*, 383, 420,
„ „ „ 439, 543, 627*
Phil. i. 8 189*, 204, 388
Phil. i. 9 240, 336, 386, 416*
Phil. i. 10 416
Phil. i. 11 133, 140, 201, 229, 378
Phil. i. 12 243*, 332, 549
Phil. i. 13 63, 578
Phil. i. 14 137*, 243
Phil. i. 15 559
Phil. i. 16 184, 332, 368, 561
Phil. i. 17 184, 209, 332, 368, 431
Phil. i. 18 90, 157, 216, 217*, 232, 387, 585
Phil. i. 19 128, 129
Phil. i. 20 128
Phil. i. 21 320, 333
Phil. i. 22 160, 169, 299*, 513
Phil. i. 23 240*, 245, 329*, 397, 578
Phil. i. 25 128, 161, 397
Phil. i. 26 136, 234, 287, 410, 466
Phil. i. 27 109, 211, 477
Phil. i. 28 166, 211, 477, 482
Phil. i. 29 259, 320, 513
Phil. i. 30 112, 572

Phil. ii. 1 122, 526
Phil. ii. 2 155, 337, 525
Phil. ii. 3 583, 587*
Phil. ii. 4 477, 482, 498
Phil. ii. 5 582
Phil. ii. 6 177*, 209, 323*
Phil. ii. 7 342, 345, 387, 616
Phil. ii. 8 122, 215, 257, 443
Phil. ii. 9 140*, 438
Phil. ii. 10 191*, 235*, 390*
Phil. ii. 11 122, 124, 551
Phil. ii. 12 151, 301, 313, 476*, 477, 498, 594
Phil. ii. 13 114, 350*, 383*, 430, 513
Phil. ii. 15 122, 123, 141, 317, 471
Phil. ii. 16 125, 410, 606
Phil. ii. 17 128, 393
Phil. ii. 18 40, 227
Phil. ii. 19 331, 344
Phil. ii. 20 300
Phil. ii. 22 317, 422*, 577*
Phil. ii. 23 45, 308*, 331
Phil. ii. 25 49, 192
Phil. ii. 27 221, 288, 408*, 471
Phil. ii. 28 70, 243*, 278, 346*, 548
Phil. ii. 29 228
Phil. ii. 30 93, 122, 191

Phil. iii. 2 223*, 609, 638
Phil. iii. 3 114, 209, 214, 216, 233, 485*,
„ „ „ 529, 593, 638
Phil. iii. 4 344, 582
Phil. iii. 5 196, 215, 520
Phil. iii. 6 65, 123, 140, 402
Phil. iii. 7 160, 168, 228, 274*, 281
Phil. iii. 8 229, 235, 442*
Phil. iii. 9 122, 133, 137, 139, 186, 390,
„ „ „ 392, 477, 482, 616

Phil. iii. 10 439, 92, 129, 189, 325*, 572
Phil. iii. 12 262, 263, 276*, 394, 638
Phil. iii. 13 321*
Phil. iii. 14 136, 205, 400*, 407, 431*, 620
Phil. iii. 15 280*, 285*, 585
Phil. iii. 16 90, 316*, 513
Phil. iii. 17 549
Phil. iii. 18 532, 573, 183, 222, 530, 628
Phil. iii. 19 114, 183, 532, 564
Phil. iii. 20 124, 139, 141*, 155, 446,
„ „ „ 453*, 551
Phil. iii. 21 324, 528, 624

Phil. iv. 1 301, 390, 523, 530, 537
Phil. iv. 3 69, 125, 313, 439, 545, 584
Phil. iv. 4 537
Phil. iv. 5 219, 235, 585
Phil. iv. 6 128, 212, 405
Phil. iv. 7 126, 186*, 280*
Phil. iv. 8 160, 609
Phil. iv. 9 160, 280*, 313
Phil. iv. 10 87, 233, 317*, 323, 382, 546
Phil. iv. 11 152, 158, 159, 321, 347, 386,
„ „ „ 402*, 597
Phil. iv. 12 77, 180, 318, 520
Phil. iv. 14 155, 345
Phil. iv. 15 84, 193, 200, 602
Phil. iv. 16 228*, 414*
Phil. iv. 17 597, 606
Phil. iv. 18 237*, 275*, 366*, 452, 528,
„ „ „ 530, 631
Phil. iv. 19 65, 137, 280*
Phil. iv. 21 137
Phil. iv. 22 629

Col. i. 3 344*, 412
Col. i. 4 135
Col. i. 6 137, 573
Col. i. 7 60, 103, 382
Col. i. 8 122, 135*, 390*
Col. i. 9 137, 412
Col. i. 12 136
Col. i. 13 237, 259
Col. i. 14 189
Col. i. 15 54, 124
Col. i. 16 116*, 235, 272*, 389, 419*
Col. i. 17 150, 419*
Col. i. 18 123
Col. i. 19 71, 588
Col. i. 20 178, 187*, 190, 212*, 397
Col. i. 21 132, 216, 341, 443, 571
Col. i. 22 188*, 318
Col. i. 23 124, 448, 475*
Col. i. 24 136, 166, 167, 189, 232, 382
Col. i. 26 227, 573
Col. i. 27 166*, 168, 330
Col. i. 28 167, 609
Col. i. 29 167, 258, 397, 410

Col. ii. 1 76, 453
Col. ii. 2 58, 65, 410, 572*
Col. ii. 5 155, 215, 236, 292, 442, 444, 469*
Col. ii. 7 216, 343, 431
Col. ii. 8 109, 128, 401, 437, 503*, 520
Col. ii. 9 546
Col. ii. 10 572
Col. ii. 11 144, 157, 189*, 216
Col. ii. 12 123, 190, 340
Col. ii. 13 127, 148, 218, 342, 391, 412,
„ „ „ 344, 433, 602
Col. ii. 14 47, 138, 220, 271
Col. ii. 15 141, 258
Col. ii. 16 420, 502, 552, 615*
Col. ii. 17 166, 532*
Col. ii. 18 187*, 190, 232, 248*, 369,
„ „ „ 467*, 480*
Col. ii. 19 83, 128, 141, 202, 224, 247*, 485*
Col. ii. 20 209, 252, 261, 370, 391, 428
Col. ii. 21 488, 501, 594
Col. ii. 22 127
Col. ii. 23 349, 575*

Col. iii. 1 292
Col. iii. 3 271, 272, 391
Col. iii. 4 530
Col. iii. 5 117*, 166*, 167, 313, 531*, 553
Col. iii. 6 265*
Col. iii. 7 269, 386
Col. iii. 8 107*, 116, 120
Col. iii. 9 397
Col. iii. 11 80, 440, 520, 552
Col. iii. 12 176, 565, 611
Col. iii. 13 440, 565*
Col. iii. 14 166*, 393, 565
Col. iii. 15 186*, 438
Col. iii. 16 439, 566, 572
Col. iii. 17 126, 307, 378, 420
Col. iii. 18 182, 270*
Col. iii. 23 307
Col. iii. 24 370*, 371, 531
Col. iii. 25 620*

Col. iv. 1 126, 257
Col. iv. 2 386, 410, 433
Col. iv. 3 517
Col. iv. 5 405, 424

Col. iv. 6 298, 316*, 318*, 585
Col. iv. 9 75
Col. iv. 10 60, 565
Col. iv. 11 84, 513
Col. iv. 12 103, 111*
Col. iv. 14 103
Col. iv. 15 102, 145
Col. iv. 16 107*, 337, 395, 550, 629*
Col. iv. 17 85, 626
Col. iv. 18 155

1 Thess. i. 1 136
1 Thess. i. 2 256, 344, 373, 376
1 Thess. i. 3 155, 187*, 190, 205, 615*
1 Thess. i. 5 420
1 Thess. i. 6 550
1 Thess. i. 7 111, 130, 175*
1 Thess. i. 8 133, 145, 420, 480
1 Thess. i. 9 122, 145, 298
1 Thess. i. 10 123, 134, 353, 594

1 Thess. ii. 1 133, 626
1 Thess. ii. 3 368, 411, 493*
1 Thess. ii. 4 271, 340
1 Thess. ii. 5 120, 488, 565
1 Thess. ii. 6 344, 411*
1 Thess. ii. 7 307, 541
1 Thess. ii. 8 101, 198*, 204, 331, 622*
1 Thess. ii. 9 205, 329, 482, 552, 587
1 Thess. ii. 10 465
1 Thess. ii. 12 128, 333
1 Thess. ii. 13 122, 191, 258*, 465, 551
1 Thess. ii. 14 46, 84, 154, 369, 390, 410
1 Thess. ii. 15 355
1 Thess. ii. 16 90, 137, 155, 329, 452*,
„ „ „ 594, 604
1 Thess. ii. 17 243*, 427
1 Thess. ii. 18 437
1 Thess. ii. 19 155
1 Thess. ii. 20 446, 513

1 Thess. iii. 1 483
1 Thess. iii. 2 113, 386
1 Thess. iii. 3 184, 328*
1 Thess. iii. 5 483, 505*
1 Thess. iii. 6 371*
1 Thess. iii. 7 128
1 Thess. iii. 8 295
1 Thess. iii. 9 57, 226
1 Thess. iii. 10 155, 552
1 Thess. iii. 11 139, 150, 316
1 Thess. iii. 13 155, 417*, 528, 624

1 Thess. iv. 1 109, 432, 513
1 Thess. iv. 2 84, 379*
1 Thess. iv. 3 319*, 427, 513, 529
1 Thess. iv. 4 274
1 Thess. iv. 5 134, 139, 486
1 Thess. iv. 6 53, 85, 115*, 171, 320, 433
1 Thess. iv. 7 394*, 411, 417*
1 Thess. iv. 8 497*
1 Thess. iv. 9 56, 324, 339*
1 Thess. iv. 10 133, 332
1 Thess. iv. 14 541*
1 Thess. iv. 15 387*, 506, 507*
1 Thess. iv. 16 135*, 150, 247*, 385, 390, 431
1 Thess. iv. 17 83, 135*, 391
1 Thess. iv. 18 301

1 Thess. v. 1 339
1 Thess. v. 2 139*
1 Thess. v. 3 65, 506, 541
1 Thess. v. 4 460*
1 Thess. v. 5 195*, 196
1 Thess. v. 6 285, 502
1 Thess. v. 8 120, 125, 195*
1 Thess. v. 10 294*, 391
1 Thess. v. 11 173
1 Thess. v. 12 335, 386*
1 Thess. v. 14 202, 405, 538
1 Thess. v. 22 120, 427
1 Thess. v. 23 150, 286, 527
1 Thess. v. 24 353
1 Thess. v. 27 226

2 Thess. i. 1 136
2 Thess. i. 4 163, 383, 410, 533
2 Thess. i. 6 122, 448*
2 Thess. i. 7 237*
2 Thess. i. 8 475*, 486
2 Thess. i. 9 125, 190, 371
2 Thess. i. 10 260, 386, 389, 565
2 Thess. i. 11 206, 397
2 Thess. i. 12 130*
2 Thess. ii. 1 383
2 Thess. ii. 2 125, 274, 370, 378*, 421,
„ „ „ 493, 618
2 Thess. ii. 3 106, 238, 239*, 499, 500,
„ „ „ 529, 545, 599*, 600
2 Thess. ii. 4 253, 626
2 Thess. ii. 6 178
2 Thess. ii. 7 123, 258, 297, 550
2 Thess. ii. 8 611, 639
2 Thess. ii. 9 60, 158, 386
2 Thess. ii. 10 189*
2 Thess. ii. 11 236

2 Thess. ii. 12 232, 475, 477, 482
2 Thess. ii. 13 73, 124, 186, 417*, 527
2 Thess. ii. 15 202, 229, 558
2 Thess. ii. 16 69, 150
2 Thess. ii. 17 155, 316

2 Thess. iii. 2 584
2 Thess. iii. 3 89
2 Thess. iii. 4 137, 233
2 Thess. iii. 5 118, 155, 185, 286, 316
2 Thess. iii. 6 77, 432
2 Thess. iii. 7 298
2 Thess. iii. 8 351*, 493
2 Thess. iii. 9 597
2 Thess. iii. 10 161, 475, 476, 477, 478
2 Thess. iii. 11 274, 347, 638
2 Thess. iii. 12 143, 198, 381
2 Thess. iii. 13 345
2 Thess. iii. 14 119*, 253, 477
2 Thess. iii. 15 228, 521, 527, 602
2 Thess. iii. 16 150, 217

1 Tim. i. 1 139
1 Tim. i. 2 137*
1 Tim. i. 3 315, 321*, 433, 488, 566, 570*
1 Tim. i. 4 140, 488
1 Tim. i. 5 139, 368, 570*
1 Tim. i. 6 196
1 Tim. i. 7 169, 253, 488
1 Tim. i. 8 638
1 Tim. i. 9 161, 211, 638
1 Tim. i. 10 520
1 Tim. i. 11 229
1 Tim. i. 12 348*
1 Tim. i. 13 341
1 Tim. i. 14 133
1 Tim. i. 15 107, 234, 585
1 Tim. i. 16 288, 549
1 Tim. i. 18 224, 387*
1 Tim. i. 19 406, 524
1 Tim. i. 20 195*, 288

1 Tim. ii. 1 256, 332, 611
1 Tim. ii. 2 70, 386, 524, 593*
1 Tim. ii. 3 534
1 Tim. ii. 4 553*
1 Tim. ii. 6 58, 383, 533
1 Tim. ii. 7 527, 562, 565, 610
1 Tim. ii. 8 68*, 283, 321, 332, 544
1 Tim. ii. 9 68
1 Tim. ii. 10 158*
1 Tim. ii. 12 122, 206
1 Tim. ii. 15 293, 516*, 631*

1 Tim. iii. 1 204, 537, 585
1 Tim. iii. 2 117*, 525
1 Tim. iii. 4 117
1 Tim. iii. 5 205, 279, 452*, 477, 565
1 Tim. iii. 6 191*, 430
1 Tim. iii. 12 117*
1 Tim. iii. 13 140
1 Tim. iii. 14 69, 243*, 331, 537
1 Tim. iii. 15 166*, 243, 298, 627
1 Tim. iii. 16 123, 124, 260*, 413, 538, „ „ „ 588*, 639*

1 Tim. iv. 1 187*, 427, 428
1 Tim. iv. 3 139, 622*
1 Tim. iv. 4 343
1 Tim. iv. 6 128, 164
1 Tim. iv. 7 257, 313, 405
1 Tim. iv. 8 140, 213
1 Tim. iv. 10 410
1 Tim. iv. 11 313, 537
1 Tim. iv. 12 537
1 Tim. iv. 13 296, 313, 520, 537
1 Tim. iv. 14 205, 377*, 537
1 Tim. iv. 15 79, 155, 287, 385, 386, „ „ „ 520, 537
1 Tim. iv. 16 537

1 Tim. v. 1 527, 537
1 Tim. v. 4 77, 347, 631*
1 Tim. v. 5 130, 233, 409, 410, 433, 611
1 Tim. v. 7 313
1 Tim. v. 8 205, 239, 259, 477
1 Tim. v. 9 477, 590*
1 Tim. v. 10 234, 387, 609
1 Tim. v. 13 347*, 432, 480*
1 Tim. v. 14 537
1 Tim. v. 15 621
1 Tim. v. 16 83, 590
1 Tim. v. 17 206
1 Tim. v. 18 585
1 Tim. v. 19 64, 313, 375*, 420, 605
1 Tim. v. 21 477
1 Tim. v. 22 200*, 209, 430, 501, 537
1 Tim. v. 23 127, 498*, 501, 537, 548
1 Tim. v. 24 171, 537, 559
1 Tim. v. 25 514

1 Tim. vi. 1 407, 537
1 Tim. vi. 2 143, 202, 502, 521
1 Tim. vi. 3 56, 57, 537
1 Tim. vi. 4 406, 518
1 Tim. vi. 5 78, 102, 196, 229, 427, 428
1 Tim. vi. 6 546

1 Tim. vi. 7 585
1 Tim. vi. 8 75
1 Tim. vi. 9 525
1 Tim. vi. 11 120, 183, 313
1 Tim. vi. 12 202, 224, 312*
1 Tim. vi. 13 107, 375
1 Tim. vi. 15 246
1 Tim. vi. 17 136*, 192*, 236*, 273, 334
1 Tim. vi. 18 201
1 Tim. vi. 19 202
1 Tim. vi. 20 183, 253, 314, 549

2 Tim. i. 1 402
2 Tim. i. 3 372*, 448*
2 Tim. i. 4 155, 544
2 Tim. i. 5 582*
2 Tim. i. 8 189, 314
2 Tim. i. 10 116, 139, 534
2 Tim. i. 11 527
2 Tim. i. 12 319, 396, 438
2 Tim. i. 13 139
2 Tim. i. 14 140, 314
2 Tim. i. 15 195
2 Tim. i. 16 73, 78
2 Tim. i. 17 219
2 Tim. i. 18 78, 242*, 321, 365*

2 Tim. ii. 1 133, 153, 313
2 Tim. ii. 2 160, 319, 378*
2 Tim. ii. 3 314
2 Tim. ii. 4 287
2 Tim. ii. 5 477, 556*
2 Tim. ii. 6 556*
2 Tim. ii. 7 78, 286
2 Tim. ii. 8 313
2 Tim. ii. 10 140, 234, 287, 605
2 Tim. ii. 11 86, 143, 585

2 Tim. ii. 14 313, 394, 533, 537, 624
2 Tim. ii. 16 78
2 Tim. ii. 18 334
2 Tim. ii. 22 223*
2 Tim. ii. 26 621

2 Tim. iii. 1 124
2 Tim. iii. 2 520
2 Tim. iii. 4 245, 638
2 Tim. iii. 6 366
2 Tim. iii. 8 66, 229, 230, 406
2 Tim. iii. 10 155
2 Tim. iii. 11 74, 420
2 Tim. iii. 12 614*
2 Tim. iii. 14 314, 365
2 Tim. iii. 15 120, 370
2 Tim. iii. 16 96*, 213, 416

2 Tim. iv. 1 537, 552, 630
2 Tim. iv. 2 79, 314, 520*
2 Tim. iv. 3 83, 481
2 Tim. iv. 6 152, 274
2 Tim. iv. 7 132, 224, 523, 638
2 Tim. iv. 8 273*
2 Tim. iv. 9 602
2 Tim. iv. 10 103
2 Tim. iv. 13 22, 395
2 Tim. iv. 14 78
2 Tim. iv. 15 223, 314
2 Tim. iv. 16 476, 501
2 Tim. iv. 17 74, 259, 514
2 Tim. iv. 18 621*
2 Tim. iv. 20 219
2 Tim. iv. 21 372

Titus i. 1 402, 565*
Titus i. 2 565*
Titus i. 3 534*, 565*, 568*
Titus i. 5 112, 258*, 288
Titus i. 6 117*, 139, 386, 477, 525
Titus i. 7 192
Titus i. 9 202
Titus i. 10 368
Titus i. 11 332, 480*
Titus i. 12 69, 154*, 640*
Titus i. 13 217, 313
Titus i. 15 88, 155, 518, 559*

Titus ii. 2 217, 322
Titus ii. 4 290, 525
Titus ii. 5 101, 154
Titus ii. 7 228, 257*, 406
Titus ii. 8 64, 424, 477, 591
Titus ii. 9 154, 482
Titus ii. 10 131, 482
Titus ii. 11 132
Titus ii. 12 127, 344, 355
Titus ii. 13 130*, 344, 355, 544
Titus ii. 14 197, 288

Titus iii. 1 313
Titus iii. 3 120, 593*
Titus iii. 4 139
Titus iii. 5 66,139,163 189, 193, 390*, 402
Titus iii. 6 163, 163, 378
Titus iii. 7 157, 216
Titus iii. 8 108, 205, 253
Titus iii. 9 68, 78, 524

Titus iii. 12 102
Titus iii. 13 103, 313
Titus iii. 14 77
Titus iii. 15 585

Philem. 1 189*
Philem. 4 256, 345
Philem. 5 139, 155, 410*
Philem. 6 338, 416, 462*
Philem. 9 189*
Philem. 10 164, 628
Philem. 11 278, 638
Philem. 12 530
Philem. 13 189*, 270, 283*, 383
Philem. 14 270, 283*, 330, 463, 617
Philem. 16 403, 420
Philem. 17 313
Philem. 18 85, 227, 292
Philem. 19 278, 521
Philem. 20 137, 198, 286, 549, 638
Philem. 22 594
Philem. 23 519

Heb. i. 1 375*
Heb. i. 2 176*, 228, 438, 527
Heb. i. 3 125, 187*, 216, 237*, 256, 344, 384
Heb. i. 4 240, 245, 271
Heb. i. 6 210, 308
Heb. i. 7 352, 405*, 588
Heb. i. 8 182
Heb. i. 9 435, 226, 277*, 404
Heb. i. 10 435
Heb. i. 11 53, 266
Heb. i. 13 228, 271, 367*, 558, 605
Heb. i. 14 120

Heb. ii. 1 89, 242, 243
Heb. ii. 2 545
Heb. ii. 3 205, 340, 379*, 545, 621
Heb. ii. 4 545
Heb. ii. 6 89
Heb. ii. 8 442, 446, 447*, 454
Heb. ii. 9 198*, 343, 399*, 462*, 534, 551
Heb. ii. 10 320, 343*, 409, 627
Heb. ii. 11 366, 448*, 585
Heb. ii. 13 582
Heb. ii. 14 200, 272*, 281, 288, 541, 552
Heb. ii. 15 329*, 380
Heb. ii. 16 202, 267*, 606
Heb. ii. 17 209, 227*, 230
Heb. ii. 18 159*, 387*

Heb. iii. 1 194, 200, 314
Heb. iii. 2 60
Heb. iii. 3 67, 190*, 206, 240*, 271, 404
Heb. iii. 4 350, 562
Heb. iii. 5 340*
Heb. iii. 6 126, 158, 409, 527
Heb. iii. 7 575
Heb. iii. 8 385, 401*
Heb. iii. 9 436
Heb. iii. 10 85, 450
Heb. iii. 11 462, 500
Heb. iii. 12 194*, 329, 416, 503, 538
Heb. iii. 13 Pl1, 151, 189*
Heb. iii. 15 571*
Heb. iii. 16 53, 378, 426, 442, 510, 571*
Heb. iii. 17 73, 230
Heb. iii. 19 438

Heb. iv. 1 197, 319, 613
Heb. iv. 2 87, 219*, 221, 229, 260, 475
Heb. iv. 3 123, 134, 265, 343, 344, 462, 500
Heb. iv. 4 271, 370. 522, 588, 590*
Heb. iv. 7 113, 199, 385
Heb. iv. 8 146*, 304*
Heb. iv. 9 445
Heb. iv. 10 154 421
Heb. iv. 11 162, 386, 388, 550
Heb. iv. 12 240, 247
Heb. iv. 13 147*, 406*, 442
Heb. iv. 14 202
Heb. iv. 15 91, 143, 475, 483
Heb. iv. 16 66, 397

Heb. v. 1 230, 382
Heb. v. 2 209, 229
Heb. v. 3 410, 440, 593*
Heb. v. 4 106, 550, 582*
Heb. v. 5 318, 582*
Heb. v. 6 592*
Heb. v. 7 152, 158, 197, 371, 621
Heb. v. 8 159, 166*, 344, 637
Heb. v. 10 229
Heb. v. 11 115*, 215, 319, 450
Heb. v. 12 59, 169, 190, 324, 339, 350*, 399*
Heb. v. 13 200, 521, 562, 584*
Heb. v. 14 120, 195*, 399, 405, 528

Heb. vi. 1 188*, 482, 531, 550, 635
Heb. vi. 2 187*, 192*, 439, 550, 551*
Heb. vi. 3 285
Heb. vi. 4 122, 198*
Heb. vi. 5 123, 198
Heb. vi. 6 212, 319, 339, 343, 344, 396, 605

Heb. vi. 7 131, 139, 200, 343, 376, 399, 438
Heb. vi. 8 195, 351*, 584
Heb. vi. 9 120, 202, 229
Heb. vi. 10 163, 205, 319, 343, 438, 630
Heb. vi. 11 321, 405, 544
Heb. vi. 12 442
Heb. vi. 13 222, 382, 575
Heb. vi. 14 354*, 443
Heb. vi. 16 88, 192, 222, 242, 382, 575*
Heb. vi. 17 216, 235, 243, 254, 387*
Heb. vi. 18 134, 202, 386*, 549
Heb. vi. 19 66, 69, 549
Heb. vi. 20 472*

Heb. vii. 1 110
Heb. vii. 2 351*, 412
Heb. vii. 3 488
Heb. vii. 4 61, 412, 528, 534, 549*, 560*
Heb. vii. 5 344, 486
Heb. vii. 6 71, 177*, 271, 273*, 486*
Heb. vii. 7 178
Heb. vii. 8 340
Heb. vii. 9 273*, 317*, 378*, 449*
Heb. vii. 11 67, 261*, 304*, 482*, 562
Heb. vii. 12 123, 192, 424*, 447, 453*
Heb. vii. 13 370, 409, 433, 447
Heb. vii. 14 271, 397, 447
Heb. vii. 15 240*
Heb. vii. 16 98, 99
Heb. vii. 17 522, 588
Heb. vii. 19 178
Heb. vii. 20 104, 565*, 586
Heb. vii. 21 377, 610
Heb. vii. 23 329
Heb. vii. 24 108*, 143, 330, 528
Heb. vii. 25 382
Heb. vii. 26 197, 438*
Heb. vii. 27 154*, 421
Heb. vii. 28 228

Heb. viii. 1 384, 534, 574
Heb. viii. 2 163, 176*
Heb. viii. 3 299
Heb. viii. 4 40, 121, 304, 589
Heb. viii. 5 191, 260, 271, 285, 522, 562,
„ „ „ 588, 595
Heb. viii. 6 89, 261, 271, 524
Heb. viii. 7 304
Heb. viii. 8 146*, 209, 436
Heb. viii. 9 225, 401, 430, 571*
Heb. viii. 10 184, 225, 352, 573*
Heb. viii. 11 174, 507*
Heb. viii. 13 195, 271

Heb. ix. 1 133, 435*, 575
Heb. ix. 2 129, 140, 236, 435*, 446,
„ „ „ 636*
Heb. ix. 3 177*, 246*, 403
Heb. ix. 4 67, 116, 158*, 385*
Heb. ix. 5 68, 320
Heb. ix. 6 267*
Heb. ix. 7 131, 203*, 577
Heb. ix. 8 176*, 187, 482
Heb. ix. 9 166*, 401, 484*, 527
Heb. ix. 10 635*
Heb. ix. 11 189, 242, 410, 485, 524, 525, 530
Heb. ix. 12 69, 73, 86, 154, 176*, 353,
„ „ „ 380, 495, 524
Heb. ix. 13 405
Heb. ix. 14 75, 197
Heb. ix. 15 185*, 287, 392*
Heb. ix. 16 551*, 584, 585
Heb. ix. 17 297, 394*, 480*, 549
Heb. ix. 18 271
Heb. ix. 19 74, 106, 193*, 401
Heb. ix. 20 163
Heb. ix. 21 443
Heb. ix. 22 388, 554*
Heb. ix. 23 58, 175, 177, 240, 585
Heb. ix. 24 318, 528
Heb. ix. 25 384, 401*
Heb. ix. 26 271, 283*, 392*
Heb. ix. 27 319

Heb. x. 1 163, 550
Heb. x. 2 43, 134, 303*, 329, 345, 482, 508
Heb. x. 4 584
Heb. x. 5 253, 277*
Heb. x. 6 71, 222, 277*, 583*
Heb. x. 7 182, 183, 325
Heb. x. 8 71, 222, 351*, 563*, 583*
Heb. x. 9 244
Heb. x. 10 138*, 387*, 389
Heb. x. 12 344
Heb. x. 13 297, 344
Heb. x. 14 271
Heb. x. 16 225, 351*, 573
Heb. x. 17 506
Heb. x. 18 584
Heb. x. 20 528
Heb. x. 21 409
Heb. x. 22 73, 74, 75, 229, 621
Heb. x. 24 185, 397
Heb. x. 25 151, 245, 477, 582
Heb. x. 27 170*
Heb. x. 28 392*, 420
Heb. x. 29 524, 562

Heb. x. 30 549
Heb. x. 32 205
Heb. x. 33 142
Heb. x. 34 155, 524, 549
Heb. x. 36 192
Heb. x. 37 247*, 355, 585, 610
Heb. x. 38 136*, 156, 523*, 583*
Heb. x. 39 196

Heb. xi. 1 59*, 484, 485, 546
Heb. xi. 2 260, 386, 387*, 412
Heb. xi. 3 329, 334, 539, 555*
Heb. xi. 4 240
Heb. xi. 5 71, 325
Heb. xi. 6 319
Heb. xi. 7 193*, 344, 402*, 484
Heb. xi. 8 70, 228, 268, 298, 483
Heb. xi. 9 376
Heb. xi. 11 150*, 404
Heb. xi. 12 120, 132, 162, 215, 589*
Heb. xi. 13 268, 403*
Heb. xi. 15 305*, 319
Heb. xi. 16 204, 221, 530
Heb. xi. 17 549, 114, 269*, 437, 639
Heb. xi. 18 405, 616*
Heb. xi. 19 584
Heb. xi. 20 71
Heb. xi. 21 71, 341
Heb. xi. 22 63, 205
Heb. xi. 23 230
Heb. xi. 26 228, 239, 384*, 592, 622

Heb. xi. 28 92, 106, 147*, 201, 272, 353
Heb. xi. 29 121, 251, 409, 431, 524
Heb. xi. 30 67, 408
Heb. xi. 32 280*, 439, 550*
Heb. xi. 33 120
Heb. xi. 34 62
Heb. xi. 35 288, 353*, 367, 460*, 485*
Heb. xi. 37 62, 520
Heb. xi. 38 116
Heb. xi. 39 381*, 412*
Heb. xi. 40 258*

Heb. xii. 1 344, 379, 423*, 432
Heb. xii. 2 125 206, 271, 364*, 435, 622
Heb. xii. 3 215, 230, 234, 429, 454*, 477
Heb. xii. 4 405, 429
Heb. xii. 5 205
Heb. xii. 6 168, 443
Heb. xii. 7 122, 300, 397, 481
Heb. xii. 8 445, 610
Heb. xii. 9 221, 228, 436, 527
Heb. xii. 10 200, 268, 405, 409
Heb. xii. 11 196*, 531, 550, 559
Heb. xii. 13 641*
Heb. xii. 15 22, 197*, 252*, 504
Heb. xii. 16 206, 364
Heb. xii. 17 147*, 317, 377
Heb. xii. 18 566, 609, 66, 216*, 343*
Heb. xii. 19 259, 433, 604
Heb. xii. 20 201, 316, 566*
Heb. xii. 21 566*
Heb. xii. 22 432, 528, 566*, 609*
Heb. xii. 23 134
Heb. xii. 24 240
Heb. xii. 25 259, 478, 582, 594, 633*
Heb. xii. 26 262
Heb. xii. 27 108, 460, 477

Heb. xiii. 2 205, 467*
Heb. xiii. 4 585*
Heb. xiii. 5 232, 507*, 585, 588
Heb. xiii. 7 191
Heb. xiii. 8 552
Heb. xiii. 9 391*, 495, 496
Heb. xiii. 10 199, 366*
Heb. xiii. 11 165, 168
Heb. xiii. 12 154
Heb. xiii. 13 559, 189*, 342*
Heb. xiii. 15 64, 209, 530
Heb. xiii. 16 205, 260
Heb. xiii. 17 143, 156, 382, 494
Heb. xiii. 18 373, 517, 614
Heb. xiii. 19 517, 69, 243*
Heb. xiii. 20 133, 134, 137
Heb. xiii. 22 202, 378*, 423*, 592*
Heb. xiii. 23 69, 243*, 317, 346*
Heb. xiii. 24 109, 629*

James i. 1 133, 316, 588
James i. 2 111, 432
James i. 3 235
James i. 4 477
James i. 5 201, 482, 494, 610
James i. 6 274, 443, 447
James i. 7 446*, 447, 502, 534
James i. 8 528, 534*
James i. 9 132, 622*
James i. 10 622*
James i. 11 75, 277*, 470*
James i. 12 531, 585
James i. 13 97, 194*, 371*
James i. 14 369
James i. 15 88
James i. 16 537

James i. 17 54, 80, 189, 348, 395, 527, „ „ „ 537, 641*
James i. 18 88, 170*, 537
James i. 19 301, 329, 520, 538
James i. 21 120
James i. 23 160, 274, 479, 610
James i. 24 278*, 281, 446
James i. 25 140, 237, 388
James i. 26 68, 125, 192, 477
James i. 27 89, 161, 319, 529

James ii. 1 60, 176, 186
James ii. 2 446, 572*
James ii. 3 81, 106, 153, 430
James ii. 4 60, 185, 187*, 508, 572*
James ii. 5 163, 189*, 201, 212, 228, 510
James ii. 6 86, 174, 206, 278*
James ii. 9 342, 353*
James ii. 10 168, 202, 280, 308*, 447, 582
James ii. 11 293, 479*
James ii. 12 313, 378
James ii. 13 100*, 203*, 432, 483
James ii. 14 108, 321, 585
James ii. 15 350*, 452, 518
James ii. 16 580, 585
James ii. 17 116
James ii. 18 60, 280*, 367
James ii. 19 514, 541
James ii. 20 116, 183
James ii. 22 270, 433
James ii. 23 453*, 615
James ii. 25 106, 219, 344, 571
James ii. 26 116*, 440

James iii. 1 242
James iii. 2 479
James iii. 3 192, 541, 549, 599*
James iii. 4 307, 344, 472, 604
James iii. 5 524, 548
James iii. 6 54, 134
James iii. 7 132, 219*
James iii. 8 532*, 536
James iii. 9 222, 388
James iii. 10 332
James iii. 11 128, 591
James iii. 12 493*
James iii. 13 511, 137*, 169, 313, 611
James iii. 14 174, 432, 470, 494*, 511*
James iii. 15 350*
James iii. 17 576
James iii. 18 219

James iv. 1 161, 529
James iv. 2 256, 470*, 482, 594
James iv. 3 256
James iv. 4 179*, 229, 307
James iv. 5 425*
James iv. 7 223, 312*, 537
James iv. 8 312, 313, 537
James iv. 9 313, 537, 639
James iv. 10 257, 261, 537
James iv. 13 117*, 162*, 249, 285 „ „ „ 516, 517
James iv. 14 109, 140, 447, 565, 590
James iv. 15 286*, 329*, 541
James iv. 17 147, 483, 494

James v. 1 341, 516, 537
James v. 2 274*, 537
James v. 3 60, 89, 124, 212, 537, 539
James v. 4 76, 371*, 537
James v. 5 156*, 414, 416*, 537
James v. 6 106, 174, 520, 537
James v. 7 308, 314, 592*
James v. 8 537
James v. 9 372, 537
James v. 10 228, 527, 537
James v. 11 247*
James v. 12 59, 79, 88, 222, 313, 372*, „ „ „ 442, 476, 488
James v. 13 169*, 285*, 541*
James v. 14 408*
James v. 16 209
James v. 17 325, 466
James v. 18 84, 436
James v. 20 122, 197

1 Pet. i. 1 112, 113
1 Pet. i. 2 122, 137*, 188*, 237*, 286
1 Pet. i. 3 134, 402, 551
1 Pet. i. 4 520, 525, 611
1 Pet. i. 5 124, 332, 389
1 Pet. i. 6 232, 317
1 Pet. i. 7 139*, 235*, 340, 378, 385, 459
1 Pet. i. 8 226, 466, 485*
1 Pet. i. 9 156*, 342*
1 Pet. i. 10 355
1 Pet. i. 11 193*
1 Pet. i. 12 82, 134, 355, 495
1 Pet. i. 13 314, 343, 409, 477, 550
1 Pet. i. 14 238, 352*, 477
1 Pet. i. 15 111*, 402
1 Pet. i. 17 353
1 Pet. i. 18 133, 216, 525, 527*
1 Pet. i. 19 525
1 Pet. i. 20 123, 376

1 Pet. i. 21 529
1 Pet. i. 22 186, 389
1 Pet. i. 23 340, 366, 411, 421, 549, 610
1 Pet. i. 24 277
1 Pet. i. 25 213

1 Pet. ii. 1 176, 527
1 Pet. ii. 2 204, 314
1 Pet. ii. 3 448*
1 Pet. ii. 4 122, 421, 427
1 Pet. ii. 5 317, 527
1 Pet. ii. 6 233, 252*
1 Pet. ii. 7 160, 164, 529, 549*, 551, 571*
1 Pet. ii. 8 397, 438
1 Pet. ii. 9 381, 520
1 Pet. ii. 10 343, 476, 485
1 Pet. ii. 11 143, 352
1 Pet. ii. 12 108, 342, 352, 384, 387, 411
1 Pet. ii. 13 124
1 Pet. ii. 14 379
1 Pet. ii. 15 161, 319, 465, 529
1 Pet. ii. 16 484, 494, 550, 573*, 612
1 Pet. ii. 17 314*, 538
1 Pet. ii. 19 518, 550
1 Pet. ii. 22 167, 616*
1 Pet. ii. 23 251*, 341, 590*
1 Pet. ii. 24 149*, 210, 407, 428, 429*
1 Pet. ii. 25 128, 156

1 Pet. iii. 1 75, 154, 289, 351*, 352
1 Pet. iii. 2 131, 342*
1 Pet. iii. 3 195, 531
1 Pet. iii. 4 386
1 Pet. iii. 5 134, 154, 233, 268, 341
1 Pet. iii. 6 224, 462, 494, 499, 562, 566*
1 Pet. iii. 7 242, 352, 403, 534
1 Pet. iii. 8 230, 520, 534, 586
1 Pet. iii. 9 46, 161
1 Pet. iii. 10 197, 326, 604, 614
1 Pet. iii. 11 143, 429
1 Pet. iii. 12 125, 409, 586
1 Pet. iii. 13 437
1 Pet. iii. 14 146*, 224, 293*, 443
1 Pet. iii. 15 209, 227, 534
1 Pet. iii. 17 294, 604*
1 Pet. iii. 18 215, 373, 383, 412, 433*
,, ,, ,, 441, 545
1 Pet. iii. 19 543, 545, 608
1 Pet. iii. 20 125, 156, 431, 457, 530, 543,
,, ,, ,, 131, 545, 621
1 Pet. iii. 21 189*, 191*, 192, 194*, 528,
,, ,, ,, 543, 545, 549, 562
1 Pet. iii. 22 543, 545

1 Pet. iv. 1 120, 196, 217, 262*, 263*, 271,
,, ,, ,, 313, 412*
1 Pet. iv. 2 84, 225, 226, 230, 329, 482
1 Pet. iv. 3 176, 209, 219, 262, 318, 319,
,, ,, ,, 334, 520, 627*
1 Pet. iv. 4 484, 549
1 Pet. iv. 5 552
1 Pet. iv. 6 123, 223, 281, 402*, 441, 522,
,, ,, ,, 630*, 639
1 Pet. iv. 7 397
1 Pet. iv. 8 108, 351, 372
1 Pet. iv. 9 397, 611
1 Pet. iv. 10 210, 516, 524*
1 Pet. iv. 11 108, 158*, 163, 582
1 Pet. iv. 12 209*, 405, 501
1 Pet. iv. 13 200, 209
1 Pet. iv. 14 109, 132, 401, 585
1 Pet. iv. 15 440, 446, 502, 518, 519*
1 Pet. iv. 17 324, 584, 586
1 Pet. iv. 18 174
1 Pet. iv. 19 51, 122, 254, 301, 524

1 Pet. v. 1 140, 200, 334, 384, 528, 529, 537
1 Pet. v. 2 314, 385*, 477, 610
1 Pet. v. 3 175
1 Pet. v. 5 253
1 Pet. v. 6 261, 407
1 Pet. v. 7 351*, 430
1 Pet. v. 8 124, 139, 299, 528, 534, 538
1 Pet. v. 9 123, 215
1 Pet. v. 10 58, 134*, 135, 148, 390, 538
1 Pet. v. 12 278

2 Pet. i. 1 130, 200*, 623
2 Pet. i. 2 286, 545
2 Pet. i. 3 109, 381*, 545, 617*
2 Pet. i. 4 157, 343, 410, 428, 524, 545, 566*
2 Pet. i. 5 142, 313, 443, 545, 566*
2 Pet. i. 6 443, 545
2 Pet. i. 7 443, 545
2 Pet. i. 8 397, 489
2 Pet. i. 9 158, 185, 187, 454*, 480*, 553*
2 Pet. i. 10 128, 256, 290, 313, 506, 527,
,, ,, ,, 549, 551
2 Pet. i. 11 69, 126, 534
2 Pet. i. 12 205, 227, 344
2 Pet. i. 13 408*, 452*
2 Pet. i. 14 551
2 Pet. i. 15 89, 256, 321, 340
2 Pet. i. 16 630
2 Pet. i. 17 212, 278*, 351*, 365, 369*
2 Pet. i. 18 352*
2 Pet. i. 19 243*, 297, 345, 551

2 Pet. i. 20 161, 196
2 Pet. i. 21 122, 173, 549

2 Pet. ii. 1 351*, 443*
2 Pet. ii. 2 399, 400
2 Pet. ii. 3 120, 149, 217*, 223*, 386, 422, „ „ „ 466, 579, 639
2 Pet. ii. 4 205, 216, 342*, 448, 478, 545, „ „ „ 566, 569*
2 Pet. ii. 5 82, 249*, 342, 344*, 545, 566, 569
2 Pet. ii. 6 125, 190, 210*, 340, 531, 545, „ „ „ 566, 569
2 Pet. ii. 7 131, 193, 259, 369*, 545, 566, 569
2 Pet. ii. 8 118, 268, 545, 566, 569
2 Pet. ii. 9 342, 569*
2 Pet. ii. 10 237, 345, 594*
2 Pet. ii. 11 243*, 395*
2 Pet. ii. 12 159, 397, 440, 628*
2 Pet. ii. 13 185*, 416, 430*
2 Pet. ii. 14 108, 174, 192, 194*, 201, 238, 525
2 Pet. ii. 15 185*, 219
2 Pet. ii. 16 95, 388, 538
2 Pet. ii. 18 342*, 529*
2 Pet. ii. 19 219*, 273, 344
2 Pet. ii. 20 273, 292, 428, 514, 534
2 Pet. ii. 21 239, 282, 320, 334, 482*, 627
2 Pet. ii. 22 109, 352, 588*, 641

2 Pet. iii. 1 58, 142*, 527, 537, 550*
2 Pet. iii. 2 190, 191, 205, 318, 529, 550
2 Pet. iii. 3 376, 572
2 Pet. iii. 4 124, 146, 267, 588, 591, 596*, „ „ „ 612, 632*
2 Pet. iii. 5 120, 121, 217*, 351*, 419*, „ „ „ 446, 453*, 467*
2 Pet. iii. 6 604*
2 Pet. iii. 7 518
2 Pet. iii. 8 395, 502
2 Pet. iii. 9 197, 484
2 Pet. iii. 10 87, 120, 125, 514
2 Pet. iii. 11 342*
2 Pet. iii. 12 121, 158*, 400*
2 Pet. iii. 13 524*, 527
2 Pet. iii. 14 219, 321
2 Pet. iii. 15 228
2 Pet. iii. 16 110, 143, 405
2 Pet. iii. 17 216, 314, 427, 429

1 John i. 1 124, 272, 567*, 607*, 609, 611
1 John i. 2 562, 565
1 John i. 3 132, 287, 443, 562, 567*
1 John i. 5 161, 199, 499
1 John i. 6 376, 537, 610
1 John i. 7 197
1 John i. 8 253, 537
1 John i. 9 461*, 537
1 John i. 10 537, 551

1 John ii. 1 537
1 John ii. 2 558, 577*
1 John ii. 3 161, 545
1 John ii. 4 483, 537, 610
1 John ii. 5 40, 185, 543
1 John ii. 6 537
1 John ii. 7 124, 524*
1 John ii. 8 267, 386, 524
1 John ii. 9 537
1 John ii. 10 639
1 John ii. 12 80, 146, 278, 400
1 John ii. 13 278
1 John ii. 15 185, 537
1 John ii. 16 529
1 John ii. 17 639
1 John ii. 18 124, 537
1 John ii. 19 73, 74, 304*, 317
1 John ii. 20 371
1 John ii. 21 172*, 278
1 John ii. 22 114, 128, 604
1 John ii. 24 128, 574*
1 John ii. 25 225, 530, 628*
1 John ii. 26 278
1 John ii. 27 277*, 339, 574*, 610, 612*
1 John ii. 2 287, 308, 314

1 John iii. 1 122, 460*, 537, 615
1 John iii. 2 122, 209
1 John iii. 4 114, 537
1 John iii. 5 267*, 288, 537
1 John iii. 6 537
1 John iii. 7 501, 537
1 John iii. 8 161, 267, 288, 537
1 John iii. 9 537
1 John iii. 10 514, 537
1 John iii. 11 161, 338*, 623*
1 John iii. 12 623*
1 John iii. 13 542
1 John iii. 14 273, 457
1 John iii. 17 40, 185, 543, 622
1 John iii. 18 116, 412, 489, 502*, 537
1 John iii. 19 368, 386, 537, 582
1 John iii. 20 155, 203, 537, 582*
1 John iii. 22 214, 256
1 John iii. 23 161, 338
1 John iii. 24 161, 411, 529, 578

1 John iv. 1 514, 537

1 John iv. 2 346
1 John iv. 4 239, 537, 632*
1 John iv. 5 537
1 John iv. 6 128, 480, 537, 543
1 John iv. 7 537
1 John iv. 8 475, 537
1 John iv. 9 133, 161, 218*, 417*, 537
1 John iv. 10 161, 527, 537, 555
1 John iv. 11 292, 448
1 John iv. 12 499, 537
1 John iv. 13 161, 199, 366*
1 John iv. 14 527
1 John iv. 15 114, 307
1 John iv. 16 260, 553
1 John iv. 17 137, 161, 338, 566
1 John iv. 20 274*
1 John iv. 21 371

1 John v. 1 178, 537
1 John v. 2 161, 368, 545
1 John v. 3 161
1 John v. 4 161, 178
1 John v. 5 537
1 John v. 6 114, 128, 144, 380*, 498
1 John v. 9 271, 537, 619
1 John v. 10 225, 474*
1 John v. 11 161
1 John v. 12 475, 537
1 John v. 13 134, 278, 288, 549
1 John v. 14 161, 256
1 John v. 15 295
1 John v. 16 225, 475*, 523*, 530*, 537, 549
1 John v. 17 537
1 John v. 18 343, 537
1 John v. 19 437, 537
1 John v. 20 133*, 157*, 162, 234, 274, „ „ „ 287, 421*, 528
1 John v. 21 314

2 John 1 113, 141, 562
2 John 2 411*, 578
2 John 4 366, 526
2 John 6 146, 161
2 John 7 134*, 140, 142*, 157, 346, 483, 632*
2 John 8 259
2 John 10 479
2 John 11 200
2 John 12 70, 278, 283, 331, 378

3 John 2 373*
3 John 4 69, 162, 338, 347, 595*
3 John 5 397
3 John 6 122, 345
3 John 7 370*, 383, 638
3 John 8 638
3 John 9 51, 141, 278
3 John 10 232, 429, 475, 494
3 John 12 261*, 271
3 John 13 378
3 John 14 331

Jude 1 190, 212, 421*
Jude 3 256, 321, 330, 333
Jude 4 130*, 140, 528, 534, 605
Jude 5 343, 620*
Jude 6 125, 188*, 216, 273
Jude 7 230, 594, 623
Jude 8 443
Jude 9 209*
Jude 11 189, 206
Jude 13 176
Jude 14 41, 71, 211, 277*, 370, 384
Jude 15 163, 222
Jude 16 116, 572*
Jude 17 205
Jude 19 114, 116
Jude 20 122, 345
Jude 21 137, 397
Jude 23 85, 370

Rev. i. 1 75, 125
Rev. i. 2 126
Rev. i. 3 519
Rev. i. 4 68, 113, 182*, 536, 587
Rev. i. 5 197, 532, 536*
Rev. i. 6 530, 580
Rev. i. 7 222, 410
Rev. i. 9 268, 521
Rev. i. 10 184*
Rev. i. 13 66, 395*
Rev. i. 14 247
Rev. i. 16 525
Rev. i. 17 114
Rev. i. 18 65
Rev. i. 19 514
Rev. i. 20 163, 231*

Rev. ii. 2 76, 321, 545
Rev. ii. 3 76
Rev. ii. 5 155*, 296, 541*, 611
Rev. ii. 6 595*
Rev. ii. 8 87, 276
Rev. ii. 9 321, 545, 551, 582
Rev. ii. 10 366, 589
Rev. ii. 11 506
Rev. ii. 12 132, 525

Rev. ii. 13 83,103,395,422,472, 610, 612*
Rev. ii. 14 223, 227
Rev. ii. 16 155, 214*, 376
Rev. ii. 17 198, 579*
Rev. ii. 18 108, 579
Rev. ii. 19 127, 155, 520
Rev. ii. 20 52, 81, 535*
Rev. ii. 21 331
Rev. ii. 22 376
Rev. ii. 23 339
Rev. ii. 24 235, 528
Rev. ii. 25 308
Rev. ii. 26 574

Rev. iii. 1 155
Rev. iii. 2 89, 155, 334, 514
Rev. iii. 3 230, 281, 506
Rev. iii. 4 514, 631
Rev. iii. 5 227
Rev. iii. 7 65
Rev. iii. 8 148, 155
Rev. iii. 9 87, 289, 337, 526*, 610, 626
Rev. iii. 10 237
Rev. iii. 12 58 112, 148, 506, 507*, 524,
„ „ „ 536*, 574, 603
Rev. iii. 14 524
Rev. iii. 15 155, 302
Rev. iii. 16 334
Rev. iii. 17 114, 117, 271
Rev. iii. 18 226, 577
Rev. iii. 19 470*
Rev. iii. 21 384, 574

Rev. iv. 1 79, 535
Rev. iv. 3 68, 215, 221
Rev. iv. 4 227, 250, 535
Rev. iv. 5 114, 166
Rev. iv. 7 108
Rev. iv. 8 345, 398, 526, 536
Rev. iv. 9 280*, 309
Rev. iv. 10 210
Rev. iv. 11 108

Rev. v. 1 408, 409, 525
Rev. v. 2 226, 585
Rev. v. 3 491*
Rev. v. 4 227, 491*
Rev. v. 6 65, 114, 166, 526, 536
Rev. v. 7 272*
Rev. v. 8 74, 114, 166, 516
Rev. v. 9 390, 589
Rev. v. 10 206
Rev. v. 11 535*
Rev. v. 12 127, 520, 536
Rev. v. 13 108, 347, 374, 409, 526
Rev. v. 14 74

Rev. vi. 1 199
Rev. vi. 2 409
Rev. vi. 3 199
Rev. vi. 4 148, 583*
Rev. vi. 6 206, 587*
Rev. vi. 8 29, 108, 182, 234, 388, 574
Rev. vi. 9 420
Rev. vi. 10 164, 182
Rev. vi. 11 83, 174, 289, 297
Rev. vi. 12 523
Rev. vi. 13 74, 523
Rev. vi. 14 366*, 527
Rev. vi. 15 64, 128, 527
Rev. vi. 16 409

Rev. vii. 1 409, 552
Rev. vii. 2 120, 148, 212, 341*, 602
Rev. vii. 3 552
Rev. vii. 4 250
Rev. vii. 9 148, 520, 526, 527, 535*, 579
Rev. vii. 11 73, 78, 125, 210
Rev. vii. 12 128, 520, 610
Rev. vii. 14 388, 399
Rev. vii. 16 77, 506
Rev. vii. 17 191, 550

Rev. viii. 3 79, 212, 289, 514
Rev. viii. 4 216*
Rev. viii. 5 201, 272*, 520
Rev. viii. 7 519, 527, 609
Rev. viii. 8 515
Rev. viii. 9 515, 536, 592

Rev. viii. 11 108, 182, 184, 362, 367, 515
Rev. viii. 12 460*, 609
Rev. viii. 13 117, 368

Rev. ix. 1 343, 606
Rev. ix. 2 606
Rev. ix. 3 396
Rev. ix. 4 171, 474, 633
Rev. ix. 6 75, 86, 223, 506
Rev. ix. 7 604*
Rev. ix. 10 324, 623*
Rev. ix. 11 534, 591
Rev. ix. 12 179, 248
Rev. ix. 13 65
Rev. ix. 14 392, 536
Rev. ix. 17 518

Rev. ix. 18 83,362,364*,367,371,429,515
Rev. ix. 19 623
Rev. ix. 20 83, 210, 289, 366, 460*, 622
Rev. ix. 21 143, 491, 606

Rev. x. 1 525
Rev. x. 2 352*, 376, 552
Rev. x. 3 612
Rev. x. 4 70, 612
Rev. x. 5 396
Rev. x. 6 222
Rev. x. 7 71, 277*
Rev. x. 9 155, 316*
Rev. x. 10 198
Rev. x. 11 393

Rev. xi. 1 536
Rev. xi. 2 43, 250
Rev. xi. 3 436
Rev. xi. 4 536*
Rev. xi. 5 294, 541*
Rev. xi. 6 375, 396
Rev. xi. 7 152
Rev. xi. 9 267, 589
Rev. xi. 10 232, 281, 409
Rev. xi. 11 413
Rev. xi. 13 83, 514
Rev. xi. 14 179, 248
Rev. xi. 15 526, 535
Rev. xi. 17 533
Rev. xi. 18 514
Rev. xi. 19 72

Rev. xii. 1 528
Rev. xii. 2 267
Rev. xii. 3 525
Rev. xii. 4 281, 334
Rev. xii. 5 83
Rev. xii. 6 148
Rev. xii. 7 214, 327*, 519
Rev. xii. 8 491, 616
Rev. xii. 9 529, 602
Rev. xii. 11 399
Rev. xii. 13 66
Rev. xii. 14 88, 148, 177*, 249, 370
Rev. xii. 16 72
Rev. xii. 17 232, 393

Rev. xiii. 1 65, 374, 410
Rev. xiii. 2 152
Rev. xiii. 3 237*
Rev. xiii. 4 210, 214, 584
Rev. xiii. 6 222, 405
Rev. xiii. 7 409, 527
Rev. xiii. 8 148
Rev. xiii. 10 62, 83, 128, 388
Rev. xiii. 11 65, 623*
Rev. xiii. 12 149
Rev. xiii. 13 461*
Rev. xiii. 14 62, 66
Rev. xiii. 15 307, 480
Rev. xiii. 16 79, 128, 289, 409, 420, 529
Rev. xiii. 17 127, 290, 536, 594

Rev. xiv. 1 43, 79, 536
Rev. xiv. 2 606
Rev. xiv. 3 70, 250
Rev. xiv. 4 472, 527
Rev. xiv. 5 538, 616
Rev. xiv. 6 88, 409
Rev. xiv. 7 126, 536, 552
Rev. xiv. 8 191, 609
Rev. xiv. 9 410
Rev. xiv. 10 87, 91, 191*
Rev. xiv. 11 210, 631
Rev. xiv. 12 186, 536*
Rev. xiv. 13 197, 234, 289, 317*, 341*,
„ „ „ 390, 460*
Rev. xiv. 14 535*, 579
Rev. xiv. 15 212, 324, 388
Rev. xiv. 17 133
Rev. xiv. 18 155, 212
Rev. xiv. 19 526, 536
Rev. xiv. 20 372, 557

Rev. xv. 1 341
Rev. xv. 2 247*, 353, 367*
Rev. xv. 4 214, 508, 549, 585
Rev. xv. 5 72, 83
Rev. xv. 6 106, 432, 525
Rev. xv. 8 201

Rev. xvi. 1 607
Rev. xvi. 2 523, 524, 607
Rev. xvi. 3 530, 536
Rev. xvi. 6 538
Rev. xvi. 7 207*, 533
Rev. xvi. 9 225, 229, 318
Rev. xvi. 10 350
Rev. xvi. 11 622
Rev. xvi. 12 120, 133
Rev. xvi. 14 514
Rev. xvi. 15 538, 585
Rev. xvi. 18 606
Rev. xvi. 19 191, 611
Rev. xvi. 20 616

Rev. xvi. 21 281, 368

Rev. xvii. 2 149, 201
Rev. xvii. 3 201
Rev. xvii. 4 94, 226
Rev. xvii. 6 201, 224
Rev. xvii. 8 208, 626, 628
Rev. xvii. 9 149
Rev. xvii. 12 65, 515
Rev. xvii. 13 78
Rev. xvii. 14 536
Rev. xvii. 15 520
Rev. xvii. 16 89, 141*, 388
Rev. xvii. 18 114

Rev. xviii. 2 609
Rev. xviii. 3 190, 514
Rev. xviii. 4 449, 515
Rev. xviii. 5 155, 205, 247
Rev. xviii. 6 163
Rev. xviii. 7 506
Rev. xviii. 8 29, 87
Rev. xviii. 9 87, 222, 410
Rev. xviii. 10 603
Rev. xviii. 11 222, 393, 408, 499
Rev. xviii. 12 234, 520, 536, 579*, 591, 592
Rev. xviii. 13 579*
Rev. xviii. 14 75, 86, 156, 370, 427, 499, „ „ „ 506, 507
Rev. xviii. 16 591
Rev. xviii. 17 223
Rev. xviii. 20 183*, 232, 408
Rev. xviii. 21 506, 616
Rev. xviii. 22 172, 506, 603
Rev. xviii. 23 114, 506
Rev. xviii. 24 177*

Rev. xix. 1 526
Rev. xix. 3 76
Rev. xix. 4 250
Rev. xix. 5 209, 536
Rev. xix. 6 536
Rev. xix. 8 545
Rev. xix. 10 114, 582, 598, 601
Rev. xix. 11 72
Rev. xix. 12 536
Rev. xix. 13 108, 182
Rev. xix. 14 133, 392, 525*
Rev. xix. 15 141, 191*
Rev. xix. 16 246*
Rev. xix. 21 83, 201, 514

Rev. xx. 1 65, 116, 408
Rev. xx. 2 536
Rev. xx. 3 536
Rev. xx. 4 106
Rev. xx. 5 297*
Rev. xx. 7 514
Rev. xx. 8 148
Rev. xx. 10 353
Rev. xx. 11 525, 616
Rev. xx. 12 72, 368
Rev. xx. 13 133, 516
Rev. xx. 14 114
Rev. xx. 15 477, 478

Rev. xxi. 1 244, 523, 527
Rev. xxi. 2 211, 524
Rev. xxi. 4 500*
Rev. xxi. 5 228
Rev. xxi. 6 76, 148, 190, 552
Rev. xxi. 8 343*, 520
Rev. xxi. 9 132
Rev. xxi. 11 247*, 536*
Rev. xxi. 12 536*, 514
Rev. xxi. 13 41, 60, 121
Rev. xxi. 16 408*
Rev. xxi. 17 43, 65, 231*, 250, 534*
Rev. xxi. 21 249
Rev. xxi. 23 552
Rev. xxi. 25 506, 507, 562
Rev. xxi. 27 171, 506, 633*

Rev. xxii. 1 128
Rev. xxii. 2 66
Rev. xxii. 3 172
Rev. xxii. 5 120
Rev. xxii. 8 521
Rev. xxii. 9 598, 601
Rev. xxii. 10 538
Rev. xxii. 11 311*
Rev. xxii. 12 318
Rev. xxii. 13 552
Rev. xxii. 14 289
Rev. xxii. 15 585
Rev. xxii. 16 393
Rev. xxii. 18 638
Rev. xxii. 19 82, 594

ANDOVER PUBLICATIONS,

EMBRACING

VALUABLE COMMENTARIES AND BIBLICAL WORKS.

W. F. DRAPER, PUBLISHER,

ANDOVER, MASS.

Full descriptive Catalogues free on application.

ELLICOTT.

Critical and Grammatical Commentaries on St. Paul's Epistles. With Revised Translations. By Rt. Rev. Charles J. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. 8vo.

Galatians. With an Introductory Notice by Prof. C. E. Stowe, $1.25.

Ephesians, $1.25. Thessalonians, $1.25.

Philippians, Colossians, Philemon, $1.75. Pastoral Epistles, $1.75.

The whole Set in Two Volumes, bevelled edges, $6.75.

FIRST CORINTHIANS. pp. 342. $2.75.

"It is the crowning excellence of these Commentaries that they are exactly what they profess to be — *critical* and *grammatical*, and therefore in the best sense of the term, *exegetical*. ..... His results are worthy of all confidence. He is more careful than Tischendorf, slower and more steadily deliberate than Alford, and more patiently laborious than any other living New Testament critic, with the exception, perhaps, of Tregelles." — *Prof. Stowe in the Introductory Notice.*

"To Bishop Ellicott must be assigned the first rank, if not the first place in the first rank, of English biblical scholarship. The series of Commentaries on the Pauline Epistle are in the highest style of critical exegesis." — *Methodist Quarterly.*

"His Commentaries are exactly what he styles them, critical and grammatical. His notes are brief, modest, unpretending, faithful, laborious, full of the most accurate and varied learning, without the taints of pedantry, and always expressed in language of the utmost clearness and simplicity." — *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

HENDERSON.

Commentaries, Critical, Philological, and Exegetical. Translated from the Original Hebrew. By E. Henderson, D.D. 8vo.

The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets. With a Biographical Sketch of the Author by Professor E. P. Barrows. $3.00.

Jeremiah and Lamentations, $2.25. Ezekiel, $1.75.

"His Commentaries on the Minor Prophets and on Isaiah, are probably the best specimens of exegetical talent and learning which have ever appeared in England. ..... The same diligence, learning, sobriety, and judiciousness appear in Ezekiel as characterize the learned author's commentaries on Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Minor Prophets." — *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

"The learning, the sound judgment, and the earnest religious spirit of the author stamp a standard value on his commentaries." — *Baptist Quarterly.*

"Just such a work as a student needs, to get at the exact sense of the original, without any superfluous matter." — *American Presbyterian Review.*

"This is probably the best commentary extant on the Minor Prophets" — *Christian Chronicle.*

LIGHTFOOT.

St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A Revised Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Dissertations. By J. B. Lightfoot, D.D., Hulsean Professor of Divinity, and Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. $3.00

"For a scholar's use Dr. Lightfoot's Commentary is invaluable. He and Bishop Ellicott worthily supplement each other. The revised text is one of the best recent contributions to a complete text of the Greek New Testament, and the criticisms on the text are concise and to the point." — *American Presbyterian Review.*

"Among the modern English commentaries on the New Testament Scriptures this appears to us to be the best. The critical dissertations, which form a leading feature of it, are in the highest degree valuable." — *New Englander.*

MURPHY.

Critical and Exegetical Commentaries, with New Translations. By James G. Murphy, LL.D., T. C. D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. 8vo.

Genesis. With a Preface by J. P. Thompson, D.D., New York. $3.00.

Exodus, $2.50. **Exodus, crown 8vo.**, $1.25.

Leviticus, $2.25. **Daniel, 12mo.**, $1.25. **Psalms**, $3.50.

"The Commentaries of Murphy have many excellences. They are clear, discriminating, and comprehensive." — *Baptist Quarterly.*

"Thus far nothing has appeared in this country for half a century on the first two books of the Pentateuch so valuable as the present two volumes [on Genesis and Exodus]. His style is lucid, animated, and often eloquent. His pages afford golden suggestions and key-thoughts." — *Methodist Quarterly.*

"Like the other Commentaries of Dr. Murphy, his Commentary on the Psalms is distinguished by the ease and perspicuity of its style, its freedom from pedantry and the excellent religious spirit pervading it." — *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

PEROWNE.

The Book of Psalms. A New Translation. With Introductions and Notes Explanatory and Critical. By J. J. Stewart Perowne, D.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Canon of Llandaff. Reprinted from the Third English Edition. Two Volumes. 8vo. $6.75

"It comprises in itself more excellences than any other commentary on the Psalms in our language, and we know of no single commentary in the German language which, all things considered, is preferable to it." — *Baptist Quarterly.*

STUART.

Critical and Exegetical Commentaries, with translations of the Text, by Moses Stuart, late Professor of Sacred Literature in Andover Theological Seminary. 12mo.

Romans $1.75. **Hebrews**, $1.75. **Proverbs**, $1.50.

Ecclesiastes, $1.25.

The Commentaries on the Romans, Hebrews, and Ecclesiastes are edited and revised by Prof. R. D. C. Robbins.

"His Commentary on the Romans is the most elaborate of all his works. .... Regarding it in all its relations, its antecedents and consequents, we pronounce it the most important Commentary which has appeared in this country on this Epistle. .... The Commentary on Proverbs is the last work from the pen of Prof. Stuart. Both this Commentary and the one preceding it, on Ecclesiastes, exhibit a mellowness of spirit which savors of the good man ripening for heaven. ..... In learning and critical acumen they are equal to his former works." — *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

Gardiner. ***Biblical Works by Frederic Gardiner, D.D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School:***

A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek, according to the Text of Tischendorf, with a Collation of the Textus Receptus, and of the Texts of Griesbach, Lachmann, and Tregelles. Revised Edition. With an Appendix on the Principles of Textual Criticism, and the Canons of Eusebius. [See full title below.] 8vo. $2.50

The Principles of Textual Criticism, with a List of all the known Greek Uncials, and a Table representing graphically the parts of the Text of the New Testament contained in each, also the Canons of Eusebius. 8vo. pp. 64. Paper Covers, 50 cts. Cloth, flexible, 75 cts.

A Harmony of the Four Gospels in English, according to the Authorized Version; corrected by the best Critical Editions of the Original. [Arranged in paragraphs.] 8vo. pp. 324. $1.75

Diatessaron. The Life of Our Lord in the Words of the Gospels. [Arranged in one continuous narrative.] 16mo. .80

Cary. ***An Introduction to the Greek of the New Testament.*** By George L. Cary, of the Meadville Theological Seminary. 12mo. pp. 72. 75 cents.

"This is substantially a primary Greek Grammar of the New Testament, intended for those who have had no previous knowledge of the language."—*Central Baptist.*

"The simplicity of its method, its conciseness and perspicuity admirably adapt it to the use of such persons."—*Theological and Homiletic Monthly.*

Buttmann. ***A Grammar of the New Testament Greek.*** By Alexander Buttmann. Authorized Translation [by Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D.]; with numerous additions and corrections by the Author. 8vo. pp. xx and 474. $2.75

Buttmann's Grammar is more exclusively philological than that of Winer, it has less the character of a concise commentary. It is thoroughly scholarly, lucid, and compact. For comparing New Testament and Classic usage running references are made throughout the book to the Grammars of Hadley, Crosby, Donaldson, Jelf, and others. Winer and Buttmann supplement each other admirably.

From the American Presbyterian Review. — "By far the most important work on the Grammar of the New Testament Greek which has been produced of late years."

Winer. ***A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament:*** prepared as a Solid Basis for the Interpretation of the New Testament. By Dr. George Benedict Winer. Seventh Edition, enlarged and improved. By Dr. Gottlieb Lünemann, Professor of Theology at the University of Göttingen. Revised and Authorized Translation. [By Prof. J. Henry Thayer, D.D.]. 8vo. pp. 744. $4.00

Winer is the most valuable of all aids for a thorough and fundamental theological scholarship. Nothing has been left undone by Professor Thayer to make this the most complete and correct edition of the most celebrated of all New Testament Grammars. Three full Indexes have been added. One of them, that of passages in the New Testament explained or cited, occupies sixty pages. The texts that are merely cited are distinguished from these which are commented upon. In an important sense the book gives a grammatical commentary on the more difficult texts of the New Testament.

MINISTERIAL CULTURE (Phelps).

By Austin Phelps, Professor of Sacred Rhetoric in Andover Theological Seminary. 18mo. pp. 28. Paper, 10 cents.

"Its value is far out of proportion to its size. The sentiments expressed are worthy of attention by the ministry and the churches." — *Baptist Quarterly.*

HYMNS AND CHOIRS;

or, the Matter and the Manner of the Service of Song in the House of the Lord. By Austin Phelps and Edwards A. Park, Professors at Andover, and Daniel L. Furber, Pastor at Newton. 12mo. pp. 425. $1.25.

This volume describes the true design and character of hymns; it comments on their rhetorical structure and style; points out the proper method of uttering them in public worship; and the most important principles and rules for congregational singing.

"Perhaps no other volume in the English language discusses the subject of Christian Psalmody more thoroughly, or on the whole, with better taste and judgment. .... Considered as a treatise on the art of selecting psalms and hymns, from whatever collection, for use in public song, and of guiding that part of worship in a Christian assembly, it is a book to be studied by all pastors, and by all expectants of the sacred office." — *The New Englander.*

PASTORAL THEOLOGY (Pond).

Lectures on Pastoral Theology. By Enoch Pond, D.D., Professor in Bangor Theological Seminary. Second Edition. 12mo. pp. 395. $1.25.

"This volume is an excellent and practical treatise upon pastoral duty, and is heartily commended to all who are entering upon or engaged in the holy office of the Christian ministry." — *New York Observer.*

"All the special relations and duties of the ministry are fully and clearly discussed." — *American Presbyterian Theological Review.*

"A valuable feature of the book is its practical character; pastoral duties and relations, and questions which are likely to perplex the minds of young ministers especially, being treated with minuteness and plainness." — *Congregationalist.*

"No pastor, no young pastor more especially, will carefully ponder the suggestions here made without profit." — *Methodist Protestant.*

PULPIT ELOCUTION (Russell).

Comprising Remarks on the Effect of Manner in Public Discourse; the Elements of Elocution applied to the Reading of the Scriptures, Hymns, and Sermons; with Observations on the Principles of Gesture; and a Selection of Exercises in Reading and Speaking. By William Russell. With an Introduction by Prof. E. A. Park and Rev. E. N. Kirk. Second edition. 12mo. pp. 413. $1.25.

"The plan of this work is admirably adapted to aid the student, the minister, and other public speakers in the acquisition of that practical knowledge of speaking as an art, which is of very great importance to their influence and usefulness." — *Christian Observer.*

"One of the most thorough publications upon the subject, and is admirably adapted to the correction of the various defects which diminish the influence of pulpit discourse. It is already an established authority in many places." — *Literary World.*

"Full of timely hints and valuable instruction." — *Vermont Chronicle.*

CHURCH HISTORY IN MINISTERIAL EDUCATION (Smyth).

Value of the Study of Church History in Ministerial Education. A Lecture delivered to the Senior Class of Andover Theological Seminary. By Prof. Egbert C. Smyth. 8vo. Paper, 25 cents.

"It is rich and strong in style, affluent in illustration, apt in statement, and wise in suggestion, and deserves general reading among the ministry." — *Congregationalist.*

THE NEW BIRTH (Phelps);

or, The Work of the Holy Spirit. By Austin Phelps, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary, Author of "The Still Hour." 16mo. pp. 253. $1.00

CONTENTS. — Conversion — its Nature.—Regeneration the Work of God.—Truth the Instrument of Regeneration. — Responsibility as related to Sovereignty in the New Birth. — The Indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

FIVE DISCOURSES ON ST. PAUL (Monod).

To which is added a Discourse on Fatalism. By Adolphe Monod. Translated from the French by Rev. J. H. Myers, D.D. 12mo. 90 cents.

"A book unsurpassed in its department, in any language, for manly eloquence, thorough research, profound reflection, a most earnest, glowing, winning Christian spirit, united with an exact appreciation of the great Apostle's character and work, and a wise, cautious, but bold and unflinching, application of his teachings to the times in which we live." — *The Translator.*

"This French preacher is one of the best models of a Christian orator, even for the Englishman." — *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

"One of the choicest little books to be found in any language, to let one into a real acquaintance with the great Apostle." — *The Advance.*

THE THEOLOGY OF THE GREEK POETS (Tyler).

By W. S. Tyler, Williston Professor of Greek in Amherst College. 12mo pp. 365. Cloth, bevelled. $1.50.

"The aim of the author is to detect the analogies between the myths of the Greek drama and epic, and the truths of revelation. The care of the scholar and the enthusiasm of the poet have been given to the work." — *Independent.*

THE PERSON OF CHRIST (Gess).

The Scripture Doctrine of the Person of Christ. By J. A. Reubelt, D.D., Professor in Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., based on the German of W. F. Gess. 12mo. pp. 456. Cloth, $1.50.

"This treatise may be briefly characterized as an earnest and able effort to present the true and consistent doctrine of the Scriptures respecting the person of Christ, and to reconcile the varying confessional statements and views of different denominations, by carefully comparing them with the language of the Scriptures themselves. The investigation is conducted in a devout, candid, and truth-loving spirit, combined with accurate scholarship and thorough study of the subject." — *Lutheran Observer.*

WRITINGS OF ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

Essays on some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul. 12mo. $1.50.

"Dr. Whately's writings are characterized by sound thought and solid judgment Clear and solid sense is his peculiar characteristic. He is often ingenious, generally candid, almost always plain and transparent." — *Bibliotheca Sacra.*

"The Archbishop's writings are a part of the sterling theological letters of the age, and ought to be possessed by all the studious and thoughtful." — *Journal and Messenger.*

"One of those volumes which make sound learning and thorough biblical scholarship so honorable in the sight of all men. A man of exact and extensive learning, a patient and devoted student of the Scriptures, clear as crystal in his thought, and as clear in his language and methods of expressing it; a lover of truth, and not afraid to utter it." — *Universalist Quarterly.*

Essays on some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion, and Historic Doubts concerning Napoleon. 12mo. pp. 264 and 48. Bound in 1 vol. $1.50.

Historic Doubts concerning Napoleon. 12mo. Paper covers, 25 cents; cloth, 40 cents.

This Essay was designed as an answer to Hume's objections to the credibility of the Christian mirac'es.

HALEY. THE ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES OF THE BIBLE.

By John W. Haley, M.A. With an Introduction by Alvah Hovey, D.D., Professor in the Newton Theological Institution. 12mo. pp. xii and 473. $1.25.

"I do not know any volume which gives to the English reader such a compressed amount of suggestion and instruction on this theme as is given in this volume."— *Professor Edwards A. Park.*

"It would be difficult, by any amount of labor, to produce anything more convincing and satisfactory." — *The Interior.*

HALEY. THE HEREAFTER OF SIN:

What it will be; with Answers to Certain Questions and Objections. By Rev. John W. Haley, author of "Alleged Discrepancies of the Bible. 16mo. 75 cts.

"It presents, in a calm and admirable manner, the Scriptural doctrine of future retribution, divested, indeed, of the literalism with which it is sometimes presented, and showing its accordance with the deductions of a sound philosophy." — *Zion's Herald.*

HARRIS. THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST ON EARTH.

Twelve Lectures delivered before the Students of Andover Theological Seminary. By Samuel Harris, Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale College. 8vo. pp. 263. $1.50

"Not often does the Christian pastor have the opportunity to purchase a work so rich in thought and spirit, so suggestive, stimulating, and helpful." — *Baptist Quarterly.*

"It is a profound and eloquent discussion of one of the sublimest themes that the human mind can consider." — *Zion's Herald.*

HILL. A STATEMENT OF THE NATURAL SOURCES OF THEOLOGY,

with a Discussion of their Validity, and of Modern Sceptical Objections; also an Article on the First Chapter of Genesis. By Thomas Hill, D.D., LL.D. 8vo. Paper, 60 cents; cloth, flexible, 80 cents.

"Powerful discussions, rich in thought and illustration, and directed with crushing force against the positions of infidel scientists." — *The Advance.*

McCURDY. ARYO-SEMITIC SPEECH:

A Study in Linguistic Archaeology. By James Frederick McCurdy. 8vo. pp. xi and 176. $2.00.

In two main respects the work claims to have made an advance upon any of its predecessors in the same inquiry. In the first place the *morphology* of the Proto-Semitic as well as of Proto-Aryan roots is fully discussed. Secondly, it is postulated that if the two families of speech were ever one, the only evidence of their identity is to be adduced from their expressions for primitive and simple ideas The method employed in this book is to take such elementary notions and see how they have been expressed in the two systems of speech.

WRIGHT. THE LOGIC OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES.

By Rev. G. Frederick Wright. 16mo. pp. 328. Cloth. $1.50.

This work is now used in a large number of Academies and Colleges as a Text-book. Among the number are Abbot, Bradford, Cushing, Mt. Holyoke Seminary, Smith College, Mass.; Brunswick, Maine; Chapel Hill, N. C.; Cumberland University, Tenn.; North Western, Evanstown, Ill.; Asbury University, Ind.; Simpson, Iowa; Ripon, Wis.; Drury, Mo.; Central Wesleyan, Mo.; Woco, Texas.

WRIGHT. STUDIES IN SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

By Prof. G. Frederick Wright, author of "The Logic of Christian Evidences." 16mo. $1.50.

"The grand point contended for and carried is that 'Christianity, in its appeal to historical evidence, allies itself with modern science rather than with the glittering generalities of transcendentalism,' and that in its beginnings science has no advantage over religion in solidity of basis." — *The Leader*

SHEDD. ***Works and Translations by William G. T. Shedd, formerly Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Andover Theological Seminary.***

Discourses and Essays. 12mo. pp. 324. $1.25

CONTENTS. — The Method and Influence of Theological Studies; The True Nature of the Beautiful, and its Relation to Culture; The Characteristics and Importance of a Natural Rhetoric; The Nature and Influence of the Historic Spirit; The Relation of Language and Style to Thought; The Doctrine of Original Sin; The Doctrine of Atonement.

From the Presbyterian Quarterly. — "Papers like these are worthy the deepest study and the warmest admiration of the best minds."

Eloquence a Virtue; or, Outlines of a Systematic Rhetoric. Translated from the German of Dr. Francis Theremin. With an Introductory Essay [by Prof. Shedd]. Revised Edition. 12mo. pp. 216. $1.00

From the Princeton Review. — "The doctrine of the treatise is, that eloquence is distinguished from philosophy, poetry, and all other forms of expressed thought in having for its object to move men to action, and that this is accomplished by exciting their active, i.e. their moral faculties, etc. . . . . The subject is ably unfolded in this compact yet thorough treatise.

From the Bibliotheca Sacra. — "The Introductory Essay which Professor Shedd has prefixed to this valuable treatise, is elaborate, vigorous, impressive."

A Manual of Church History. By Henry E. F. Guericke, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Halle. Translated by Prof. Shedd.

Ancient Church. Comprising the First Six Centuries. [With a Preface by the Translator, a Chronological Table, an Index, and a Series of Questions.] 8vo. pp. xvi and 433. $2.75

From the Evangelical Review. — "Perhaps it would be difficult in the same space to find so much matter, or so complete a history during the period of which it treats, as is given in this Manual. The volume is one of the most valuable of its kind in the department of Ecclesiastical History."

Mediæval Church. (From A.D. 590 to 1073). pp. viii and 160. $1.25

This portion of Guericke's Church History continues the account down to A.D. 1073, when Hildebrand ascended the Papal chair as Gregory VII. It includes, the spread of Christianity among the Gothic, Scandinavian, and Sclavic races; the distracting controversies respecting the two Wills of Christ, Image Worship, and the Sacrament of the Supper; and the great schism between the East and West.

The Confessions of St. Augustine. Edited, with an Introduction, by William G. T. Shedd. 12mo. pp. xxxvi and 417. Half turkey or half calf, gilt edges, $2.50; cloth, bevelled edges, $1.25

From the Bibliotheca Sacra. — "A beautiful edition of a precious work."

From the Evangelical Quarterly. — "This beautiful edition of a theological classic is desirable on account of the careful comparison of the whole work with the Latin text, and the addition of explanatory notes."

"Prof. Shedd's Introduction is a masterly essay, which of itself is a volume for attentive reading. It ought to be read before the book is begun. Thorough, searching, and discriminating, beyond the facts it communicates, its instruction and hints are suggestive and invaluable." — *New York Observer.*

South Church, Andover. See HISTORICAL MANUAL.

SMITH. ***Select Sermons of the Rev. Worthington Smith, D.D.,*** Late President of the University of Vermont. With a Memoir of his Life, by Rev. Joseph Torrey, D.D., Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in Burlington College. 12mo. pp. xi and 368. $1.25

From the Bibliotheca Sacra. — "They [his Sermons] are specimens of a sermonizing that was uniformly excellent. In this respect they are models for preachers."

ANDOVER PUBLICATIONS.

Any book in this list will be sent by mail or express, prepaid, and its safe transmission guaranteed, on receipt of the price affixed. A discount of one fifth given Ministers, except on those marked by a *. Send for a full descriptive catalogue.

TEXT BOOKS.

Bascom's Political Economy..... $1.50
Bateman's Questions on Kühner's Greek Grammar Dr. S. H. Taylor... .40
Buttmann. Grammar of the New Testament Greek. Thayer's Translation, 2.75
Cary. Introduction to the Greek of the New Testament. For Beginners..... .75
Doederlein's Latin Synonymes..... 1.25
Gardiner, Prof. Frederic. Harmony of the Gospels in Greek..... 2.50
—— Harmony in English..... 1.75
—— The Life of Our Lord. The four Gospel narratives harmonized in one.. .80
—— Principles of Textual Criticism..... .75
The Hebrew and English Psalter. Arranged in Parallelism..... 1.00
Immer. Hermeneutics of the N. T... 1.50
Jones. Elementary Hebrew Grammar, 1.50
Shedd. Translations by Wm. G. T. Shedd, formerly Prof. in Andover Theological Seminary.
—— Theremin's Rhetoric (Eloquence a Virtue)..... 1.00
—— Guericke's Ancient Church History, 2.75
—— Guericke's Mediæval " " 1.25
Vibbert. Guide to Reading Hebrew... 1.00
Winer. Grammar of the Idiom of the N. T. Prof. Thayer's Translation.... 4.00
Wright's Logic of Christian Evidences, 1.50

MISCELLANEOUS.

*Abbot Academy, History of..... $2.00
Same, illustrated..... 3.00
Angel over the Right Shoulder... .40
Appleton, Jesse. Works of, 2 vols. in one..... 3.00
—— Lectures and Occasional Sermons. Boards..... 1.00
Augustinism and Pelagianism..... 1.25
Bascom's Political Economy..... 1.50
Carlyle's Latter-Day Pamphlets..... 1.00
Chalybæus. History of Speculative Philosophy..... 1.50
Edwards, Prof. B. B., Writings of, with Memoirs, by Prof. Park, 2 vols.. 3.00
Ellicott, Bp. C. J. Life of Christ..... 1.50
Erskine's Internal Evidence..... .60
Feuling's Φωκύλιδου Ποίημα Νουθετικον. Paper..... .30
Same, translated by D. H. Goodwin, .30
Foster, Prof. Frank H. Grotius on the Satisfaction of Christ..... 1.50
Goodrich. Bible History of Prayer... 1.00
Haley. Discrepancies of the Bible.... 1.25
—— The Hereafter of Sin..... .75
Harris, Prof. Samuel. The Kingdom of Christ on Earth..... 1.50
Haven, Pr f. Joseph. Studies in Philosophy and Theology..... 1.50
Hebrew and English Psalter, arranged in Parallelism..... 1.00
Hill, Dr. Thomas. The Natural Sources of Theology..... .80
Homer, W. B. Writings of (with Memoir by Prof. Park)..... 1.25
Howe. The Redeemer's Tears, etc.... 1.00
Historical Manual of the South Church, Andover..... $1.50
Hymns and Choirs. By Profs. Park and Phelps, and Dr. D. L. Furber..... 1.25
Kelly's Proverbs of all Nations..... 1.25
Kennedy's Life of Christ (Messianic Prophecy)..... 1.25
Lewis. The Debate between the Church and Science, etc..... 1.25
Marsh. The Shadow of Christianity.. 1.00
McCurdy. Aryo-Semitic Speech. 8vo, 1.50
Monod. Five Discourses on St. Paul, .90
Morrison, Hon. Chas. H. The Proofs of Christ's Resurrection, from a lawyer's stand-point Revised edition.... 1.25
New Testament. The Polymicrian.. .45
Park, Prof. E. A. Discourses on some Theological Doctrines as related to Religious Character. 8vo. 400 pp... 2.50
Plutarchus de Sera Numinis Vindicta. Prof. Hackett, Translator.... .60
Pond, Prof. Enoch. Pastoral Theology, 1.25
Phelps, Prof. A. The New Birth..... 1.00
—— Ministerial Culture. Paper..... .10
Punchard's Congregationalism, 2d ed. .60
Reubelt. The Person of Christ..... 1.50
Riggs, Dr. Elias. Suggested Emendations of the Old Testament..... .75
—— Suggested Modifications of the Revised Version of the New Testament.. .60
—— Both Works in one vol..... 1.25
Russell, Prof. Wm. Pulpit of Elocution..... 1.25
Schodde. The Book of Enoch..... 1.75
Shedd, Prof. W. G. T. Discourses and Essays..... 1.25
—— Theremin's Rhetoric..... 1.00
—— Guericke's Ancient Church History, 2.75
—— Guericke's Mediæval " " 1.25
—— Augustine's Confessions..... 1.25
Smith, Worthington, D. D. Sermons, with Memoirs by Prof. Torrey..... 1.25
Smyth, Prof. E. C. Value of the Study of Church History. Paper..... .25
Stuart. History of the O. T. Canon... 1.50
—— Miscellanies. Letters to Channing, 1.25
Sullivan. The Function of Thought.. 1.00
Swain. God's Ownership of the Sea. A very interesting Essay. Paper..... .25
Taylor, S. H. Classical Study: Its value..... 1.50
—— A Memorial of Samuel H. Taylor.. 1.75
Thayer, Alex. W. The Hebrews and the Red Sea. (With a Map)..... .80
Theologia Germanica...... 1.25
Tyler, Prof. Wm. S. Theology of the Greek Poets..... 1.50
Venema's Institutes of Theology..... 2.50
Whately, Archbishop. Essays on the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul..... 1.50
—— Peculiarities of the Christian Religion, and Historic Doubts. 1 vol..... 1.50
—— Historic Doubts..... .40
Wright, Prof. G. Frederick. Logic of Christian Evidences..... 1.50
—— Studies in Science and Religion..... 1.50
*Wonder-Working Providence of Sion's Saviour in New England. Paper..... 10.00

W. F. DRAPER, Publisher, Andover, Mass.

DATE DUE

THE KING'S LIBRARY
3000108544

C0-ACI-546